

FIFTH

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

BOARD OF MANAGERS

OF THE

MASSACHUSETTS

ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF THE ANNUAL MEETING,

JANUARY 25, 1837.

BOSTON:
PRINTED BY ISAAC KNAPP,
No. 25, Cornhill.
1837.

FIFTH
ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
BOARD OF MANAGERS
OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS
ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF THE ANNUAL MEETING,

JANUARY 23, 1837.

BOSTON:
PRINTED BY ISAAC KNAPP,
25, Cornhill.

1837.

"Every compromise is improper in itself
and ultimately mischievous, by which a sound
principle or theory is sacrificed, or the complete
triumph of such principle or theory prevented."

W. Walsh—

REPORT.

THE tone which the Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society would assume, in presenting their Fifth Report, is one of joyful hope to the manacled slaves—of sincere congratulation to the friends of human liberty, universally—of ardent gratitude to God. If a blood-stained, conscience-stricken nation is writhing under the rebukes and warnings of the Spirit of Truth ; if the march of Justice and Humanity is onward with accelerated speed, though obstructed by obstacles insurmountable to every thing else ; if the knees of the American Belshazzar are siniting together, in view of the condemnatory handwriting upon the wall of his palace ; and if, in every encounter of the friends of freedom with the hosts of tyranny, a glorious victory follows ; why should we not bid our enslaved countrymen rejoice in hope—and congratulate all who sympathize with them, whether at home or abroad—and offer thanksgiving to Him who is King of kings, and Lord of lords ? The acorn that was planted in the soil of the pilgrims only six years ago, has grown up into a stately oak, deepening its roots and extending its branches with every storm. The single voice which then broke upon the drowsy ear of the nation, is now lost in the thunder-tones of a congregated multitude. The

cloud, no bigger than a man's hand, which then rose in the east, now covers the land.

THE CONFLICT NOT ENDED.

But, while we assume a tone of confidence and triumph, in taking a retrospect of the past, we should deprecate giving the impression, that the warfare is almost terminated ; that watchfulness may now give place to indifference, toil to repose, zeal to passivity ; or that a final conquest is an easy matter. No. The great battle, which is to decide the destiny of this nation, is yet to be fought. Instead of the least abatement, there must be a vast augmentation of zeal and interest. Instead of beginning to fold the hands and close the eyes in slumber, we must gird up our loins afresh, watch as for our lives, and prepare for the last encounter. Instead of crying, 'ALL'S WELL!' the rallying-cry must be, 'TO THE RESCUE! FOR GOD AND LIBERTY!' Instead of ordering our forces to halt, let the animating watch-word pass from mouth to mouth, 'ONWARD!' 'ONWARD!' All history testifies, that a long-established despotism is not easily overthrown, and that tyrants are fiercer than wolves. And never, in all time, has there been an attempt before to deliver millions of our race from a brutal servitude, discarding all physical force, all carnal weapons, and relying for success solely on 'the opposition of moral purity to moral corruption, the destruction of error by the potency of truth, the overthrow of prejudice by the power of love, and the abolition of slavery by the spirit of repentance.'* With what tenacity the corrupt heart of man clings to ill-gotten power, the example of Pharaoh fearfully shows—who could not be induced to let his captives go, though visited by the most direful plagues, until all the first-born of Egypt were slain, and in the sequel it was necessary to drown the tyrant and his hosts in the depths of the sea. And by an immutable law of our being, in proportion to the degree of light resisted by oppressors, is the desperation with which they grasp the throats of their victims, and the fury which they

* National Anti-Slavery Declaration.

exhibit toward those who arraign their unnatural barbarity.—Who, then, among all the tyrants of the earth, since the world was made, have equalled in guilt or in cruelty the republican (!) slaveholders of North America? Who have ever exhibited a more ferocious spirit toward those who plead for justice, in the name of Humanity? Or who have ever more impiously contemned the voice and defied the omnipotence of Jehovah?—‘They break in pieces thy people, O Lord, and afflict thy heritage. They slay the widow and the stranger, and murder the fatherless. Yet they say, The Lord shall not see, neither shall the God of Jacob regard it.’ But ‘shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law?’ ‘Understand, ye brutish oppressors; and ye fools, when will ye be wise? He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? he that chastiseth the heathen, shall not he correct? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?’ ‘For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the Lord; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him.’

LIBERTY OF SPEECH.

No—this is not a time for repose: we may not take it for granted, that the field is won, and our term of service expired. It is true, we have not suffered our mouths to be gagged by the hand of violence, and we have faithfully delivered the message of God; but the unmolested freedom of speech, and the untrammelled freedom of the press, on the subject of *American** slavery, are yet every where denied to us, so that we continue to speak and print at the peril, not merely of our reputation, but our lives. If it were possible, by exaltation of character, or suavity of deportment, or nobleness of conduct, or propriety of speech, or mildness of temper, to conciliate a cavilling generation, and obtain at least a candid hearing before being condemned as a disturber of the peace; surely JAMES G. BIRNEY

* We may denounce *British* oppression. *Turkish* oppression, *Russian* oppression, without running any hazard, and to popular acceptance.

would be treated with respect, and allowed to testify as a witness in the great trial now pending between **LIBERTY** and **DES- POTISM**. Yet Mr. **BIRNEY** declares, that, though there are no less than thirty places of public worship in Cincinnati, he cannot obtain admittance into any one of them, that he may exhibit the sinfulness of slavery!—even though he solicits to be confronted on the spot, before a prejudiced and violent population, by any of the strongest champions on the other side of the question! So greatly do the enemies of freedom fear that the promise would be verified against themselves—‘One shall chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight.’ Certain it is, if Mr. Birney wished to give his opinions upon any other subject, he would find no difficulty in procuring a place in which to speak, and would be heard with becoming deference;—but, though a southern man, from childhood conversant with the slave system, and for many years a slaveholder, yet he is deemed unworthy of credit, branded with infamy, and debarred from giving testimony, because he has repented of the sin of oppression, emancipated his slaves, made all the restitution in his power, and is proclaiming to all slaveholders the duty of immediately breaking every yoke, undoing the heavy burden, and letting the oppressed go free! This is the head and front of his offending. And yet the people of Ohio are all opposed to slavery!

A similar state of things disgraces the capital of this Commonwealth. Why is it that the fifth annual meeting of this Society is held in the loft of a stable? * Let the winds carry the tale to the four quarters of the earth—in Boston, in the year of our Lord 1837, in the sixty-first year of American independence, not a single meeting-house, not a hall of any magnitude, can be obtained on any terms, not even for money at an exorbitant price! in which abolitionists may plead the cause of the trampled slave! But, it is believed, there is not a single pulpit

* And yet as we are forbidden to speak in the name of Jesus, who came to preach deliverance to the captive, and the opening of prisons to those who are bound, we may not marvel that our accommodations are no better than were those of him, who was cradled in a manger.

in this city,* to which a slaveholding preacher cannot find ready access, even for the avowed purpose of vindicating the soul-destroying system of slavery as a divine institution, from the Holy Scriptures! Nor is there, we presume, a public hall, which cannot be occupied by jugglers, mountebanks, ballad-singers, rope-dancers, religious impostors, &c. &c. as they shall wish to hire! Thus, in Boston and in Cincinnati, (and these cities are cited merely as specimens of the prevailing spirit of the nation,) abolitionists are deprived of the privileges which are enjoyed by strolling profligates, and are treated as the offscouring of all the earth—yet, aside from their zeal in behalf of the suffering and the dumb, who will say that in virtue, intelligence, public spirit, love of order, patriotism, peaceable behavior, general reputation, or genuine piety, they need shrink from comparison with any other class or order of men in this or any other country? It is not, as is falsely pretended, because their language is harsh, or their spirit violent, or their measures extravagant, that they receive such treatment: but because they sympathize with a despised race—will hold no truce with oppression—abhor caste—denounce prejudice against a colored skin as irrational and unholy—‘remember those in bonds,’ at least in some measure, ‘as bound with them’—maintain the duty and safety of immediate emancipation—object to the banishment of a sixth-part of the American people to the coast of Africa, on account of their complexion. Only let them become respecters of persons—preach up the necessity of a separation, wide as the vast Atlantic, between the white and free colored † population—advo-

* With one exception—Pine Street. The following resolution has been adopted by this church:

Resolved, That the members of this church regard slaveholding as entirely contrary to the spirit of the gospel—as threatening the peace, purity, and permanency of the religious institutions of our land—as greatly embarrassing the operations of christian benevolence—and as calculated to grieve the Holy Spirit of God from the churches, and thus prevent those revivals of religion which have been the glory of our land; and do therefore bear their testimony as a Church of Christ, against the crying sin of Slavery.

It may be asked, why could not the Pine-street meeting-house be obtained for the use of the Anti-Slavery Society? The reason is, that a majority of the congregation were opposed to granting such a privilege.

† Observe—not between the white and SLAVE population: they may remain in close affinity!

vocate a gradual and remote emancipation on a plan to be suggested and controlled exclusively *by the oppressors*—eulogize as patriots and christians, those who hold the image of God as their property, and who trade in ‘slaves and souls of men’—and attempt to reconcile slavery with the Bible which it banishes from four hundred thousand slave families;—and they will at once cease to be treated as outlaws, churches and halls will be gladly opened for their reception, applauses will be showered upon them by admiring assemblies, rewards will no longer be offered for their heads, lynch law will be repealed, ‘gentlemen of property and standing’ will take them by the hand, they may travel at the north or the south without perilling their lives, smiles, caresses, congratulations will be substituted for tar and feathers, brick-bats and rotten eggs, the United States’ mail will circulate safely, peace will be again restored to the bosom of the nation, and the Union be preserved in its integrity—even though they should flame vehemently against the *foreign* slave-trade, and stoutly reprobate slavery in the *abstract*!—Should this page meet the eyes of posterity, let it not be esteemed as an ingenious caricature, but as an exact delineation of the character of the American people in the year 1837.

PREJUDICE STILL RAMPANT.

In view of these things, what abolitionist talks of putting off his armor, under the delusive notion that

‘The battle is over—the victory won’?

It is true, much has been done to heal the alienation, long cherished and intense, arising from complexional differences. Thousands have thrown the cord of caste into the all-consuming fire of redeeming love. But, though the reptile Prejudice has received a severe wound, his throes are nevertheless terrific: his eyes gleam with new malignity as he lifts himself up in coils, shakes his rattles, and endeavors to spring at his victim. As a general rule, our colored brethren are yet deliberately treated with contempt in the house of worship, and, if admitted at all, driven into obscure corners, as if they had no feelings to be

wounded, no souls to be saved. They are still deprived of their rights in the tavern, the stage-coach, the rail-car, and the steam-boat, (except such as are *slaves*, who travel with their lordly masters ! *)—so that in travelling, they are exposed to every indignity, great mental and physical suffering, and frequently subjected to great expense. Their treatment, in this particular, would be quite insupportable to any other people. Their laudable efforts to obtain knowledge are treated with derision, when not viewed with alarm ; and their children are excluded from schools, academies and colleges, or are admitted only as an act of special favor, and on disgraceful conditions, except in a very few instances. The aggregate amount of suffering, reproach, mortification, and depression, which is experienced by them continually through the prevalence of the spirit of caste, is inconceivable.

MILLIONS YET IN BONDAGE—OUR OWN RIGHTS NOT SECURED.

Abolitionists may not, therefore, slumber at their post, or relax a single effort. It is true, a mighty change has been wrought in *individual* sentiment within the last five years, favorable to the rights of our colored countrymen ; but *public* sentiment is still powerfully enlisted on the side of slavery. Since this Society was organized, probably not less than 800 anti-slavery associations have been formed in various sections of the country, —averaging one a day for the last two years,—embodying many thousand members, distinguished for their philanthropy and moral worth. But still the appalling fact remains, that two millions and a half of American slaves are pining in ruthless bondage, from whom the Bible, the sanctity of marriage, personal protection, moral and intellectual cultivation, and compensation for unmitigated labor, are wrested in accordance with statutory law ; —that fourteen States in this Union are slaveholding States ; —that the seat of the National Government is the general rendezvous of slave-mongers, and the chosen abode of the Genius of American Despotism ; —that the domestic slave-trade is carried

* What an argument in favor of the benefits of a slavish condition !

on with increasing activity and terrible inhumanity, between the States ;—that no northern man, known as an abolitionist, can safely travel through the South, or reside therein in order to engage in business ;—that the whole body of the clergy and churches at the South, and a large majority of them at the North, (if we may know them by their fruits,) are decidedly in favor of the doctrines, usages and policy of the South in regard to the slave system ; and that an overwhelming majority of the representatives in Congress, as well those from the free as the slave States, are opposed to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

It is evident, then, that the friends of liberty have yet a tremendous conflict to maintain with its enemies. Wherefore let them take unto themselves the whole armor of God, that they may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all,
TO STAND.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The last Report was issued at too early a date to criticise the action of the last session of Congress upon the petitions for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia. Hence, this is the first great topic, in course, which challenges attention in the present Report. Its importance cannot be overrated, because the existence of slavery in that District is indisputable and bloody proof that this is a slaveholding nation, inasmuch as Congress has a constitutional right to abolish it, and as a majority of the members of that body are from the free states ; and because it is conceded, even by southern men, that the question which determines the fate of the system in the District, decides its fate in all the slave States. In presenting a petition from sundry inhabitants of Boston, Mr. WEBSTER remarked—‘ Believing that Congress has constitutional power *over slavery and the slave-trade* in the District, I think petitions on those subjects, respectfully presented, ought to be respectfully treated and respectfully considered.’ This is important authority. For uttering this belief, he was denounced

by Mr. KING of Alabama, who sneeringly remarked—‘ The course which that gentleman (Mr. WEBSTER) had taken, had placed him *at the head* of those men who inundated Congress with their petitions.’* It was a dignified retort of Mr. Webster—‘ By what authority does the gentleman say, that I have placed myself at the head of these petitioners? The gentleman cannot be allowed, sir, to assign to me any place, or any character, which I do not choose to take to myself.’ But he would have made his fame imperishable, if he had replied with all sincerity—‘ The post assigned to me by the gentleman from Alabama, though in his estimation contemptible, I regard as most honorable. It is nothing less than to be the WILBERFORCE of America. I shrink from it, not with any feelings of timidity or scorn, but from sincere distrust of my own competency to fill it, and because there are others more worthy to wear the crown of philanthropy. But, whether first or last, at the head or in the rear, my voice, and vote, and influence, shall be unceasingly exerted to abolish that system, which transforms so large a portion of my countrymen into slaves, and which is bringing such infamy upon the character of my country.’

Mr. Hammond of S. C. said—

‘ He could not sit here, and see *the rights of the southern people* assaulted day after day, by the ignorant fanatics from whom these memorials proceeded. He could see no difference between abolition in the District and in the States.’

Mr. Preston said—

‘ He regarded the concerted movement upon the District of Columbia as an attempt to storm *the gates of the citadel*—as *throwing the bridge over the moat*. The South must resist the danger in its inception, or it would *soon become irresistible*.’

Such testimony is of rare value, and should fill the breasts of abolitionists with high expectancy and triumphant assurance. A Senator from South Carolina discloses the fact, that the District of Columbia is the ‘ CITADEL ’ of American slavery ; and that, unless its assailants are speedily defeated, **THEY WILL**

* i. e. ‘ at the head ’ of ‘ fanatics, incendiaries and madmen.’ We now know what constitutes incendiarism, &c.

CONQUER IT. Henceforth, then, to the taunting interrogation of brutal and cowardly men—‘Why don’t you go to the South?’ be this our reply—‘Because we must first capture the “CITADEL”—and having thrown our bridge over the moat, we are now storming the gates, which must shortly yield if we persevere.’ In vain shall we look for the abolition of slavery in the South, so long as the North is engaged in perpetuating it at the Seat of Government; and well may southern oppressors tremble at the thought of losing the example and countenance of the nation, in making merchandize of man. Such a loss would make them bankrupts in character; and with the verdict of public sentiment recorded against them as the worst of oppressors, they could not long outface the Spirit of Freedom.

It is not within the scope of this Report to make a full exposure of the anti-republican doctrines, malicious accusations, idle threats, and gross absurdities, which are contained in the remarks of southern members of Congress, on the great question of HUMAN LIBERTY. Tyrants are ever bad logicians; and guilty men, when endeavoring to exculpate themselves, always confirm whatever evidence against them is merely circumstantial. The proposition, that man is an article of property, belongs to Bedlam; and nothing but the ravings of insanity can be expected from those who argue in the affirmative.

To show the utter inconsistency of the reasoning of southern men, on the subject of slavery, we place some of their conflicting sentiments in juxta-position:

TONE OF SECURITY.

Mr. Hammond—‘The people of the south do not ask or desire protection from this House, or from this Government. No, sir; on this subject, the South stands erect, self-confident, united, strong. She asks no protection (!!)—she scorns assistance, (!) and defies all opposition’!—‘The allegation of the abolitionists, that slavery was dangerous to the peace of society, and that slaveholders lived in a continual state of alarm, he utterly denied, and contended that the South had less trouble with the slaves, than the North had with their free laborers. Among no

TONE OF ALARM.

Mr. Hammond—‘He objected to the reception of the petitions, that it harassed, annoyed, and *alarmed* the people of the South; that it would render necessary the adoption, by the south, of a more severe and vigorous system of discipline.’

Mr. Preston—‘The question of abolition in this District and in the southern States is pressing upon us with a great and portentous rapidity. It is a falling body, and gathers strength as it falls. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact. The proceedings of the emancipators of the

people in the world were the affections of the heart more cherished and more gratified, than among the slaves of the South.'

Mr. Thompson—'As to discussing this subject before any human tribunal, I will not. I will not condescend to vindicate to this House, or elsewhere, this or any other of our domestic institutions. It is no affair of yours; you have no right to touch it, still less to demand a reason of us for its continuance'!—'As to any effort now or ever to accomplish their purposes, no one man at the South has any fears. No, sir, thank God, on this subject we are united, and our position is one of **SECURITY**, of **IMPREGNABLE SAFETY**.'—Sir, if I was satisfied with the language of the non-slaveholding gentleman, I was rejoiced in my heart and I was glad to listen to the manly and decided language of the gentleman from Georgia. It gave me assurance that, on this question, if no other, there will be a thorough union of the whole South, in council and in *action*, if need be, on this great and absorbing question.'

Mr. Bouldin—'Did any man ever hear or know of a nation of people that stood higher for any of the cardinal virtues—honor, truth, justice and charity, gentleness of heart and honesty, (!!!) than those who reside south of Mason's and Dixon's line? Was it thought that we should suffer by a comparison with the petitioners?'

North are pregnant with danger rapidly approaching. The public pulse is bounding with the excitement, and the public mind is convulsed like the Pythoness upon the tripod. In England and in France, the developements of popular sentiment are all against us, and the rostrum is erected to declaim against the enormity of our *social institution*. Do gentlemen say that this growing hostility can be speedily checked? Do they regard it as lightly as a summer cloud, as a slight popular breeze? Time may show how woefully mistaken they are.' 'He appealed to the high-minded Senators from the North—to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. Webster,) to devise some means, to suggest some plan, by which the just *alarm* of the South might be allayed.'

Mr. Pickens—'We must prepare for the great contest, and contend over the graves of our fathers for our *liberty* (!)—or abandon our country to the blacks, and seek a dishonorable retreat in the wilds of the West.'

Mr. Thompson—'Nothing will satisfy the excited, the almost *frenzied* South, but an indignant rejection of these petitions.' 'I tell gentlemen, that they are walking in a magazine with a lighted torch in their hands. I am sure they are not aware of the true situation of the country as to this most delicate and dangerous subject.'

Mr. Moore, (of Alab.)—'Much *excitement* was naturally produced by these petitions throughout the south; so much so, that the several legislatures of the southern states, and among them his own State, (Alabama,) were passing resolutions, calling on the other States to give them their aid in putting down those whose measures were so obnoxious to them.'

Thus, in one breath, the South 'asks no protection, scorns assistance, and defies all opposition'—in the next, she *invokes protection*, *SOLICITS ASSISTANCE*, and *DEPRECATES OPPOSITION*! Now she 'stands erect, self-confident, united, strong'—anon she is quaking with alarm, and turning deadly pale, and calling upon the North for succor, in view of certain petitions emanating from sundry 'fanatics and madmen'!—Which of these frames of mind is the true one, is sufficiently evident.

NORTHERN RECREANTS.

It would be absurd to expect temperate language from the lips, or just treatment at the hands of southern representatives, in relation to the memorialists for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. It was therefore perfectly in character for Mr. Thompson of S. C. to exclaim—‘Who is it at the North that we are to conciliate? The fanatics? Fanatics did I say, sir? Never before was so vile a band dignified with that name. They are *murderers*, FOUL MURDERERS, accessories before the fact, and they know it, of *murder, robbery, rape, infanticide*.’ Nor can it be a matter of much surprise, that Mr. Hammond of S. C. should speak of Dr. Channing in the following terms :—‘He (Mr. H.) denied that Dr. Channing played a second part to O’Connell, in the abolition question—for he did not rise so high ;—he played a second part, and the meanest part, to Garrison and Thompson, and had degraded himself to the level of Arthur Tappan and Murell,’ the famous land-pirate. But, if Congress has constitutional power over slavery in the District—if a large majority of the representatives in Congress belong to the free States—and if the people of the free States are all opposed to slavery—in looking at the conduct of northern members, we may reasonably expect to find them heartily espousing the prayer of the memorialists, asking for liberty to the captives, the opening of prisons to those who are bound. What, then, was the language of Senator Hill, of New Hampshire ?

‘He contended that too much importance was given to the acts of the fanatics, and he denied that public opinion in the North was at all in favor of abolition. He did not believe there was one in five hundred in New Hampshire in its favor.’

Mr. PIERCE of N. H. read the names of the signers to a petition from his own State.

‘He stated that he was informed that most of them were children at school, and that some canting, hypocritical preacher had been round to the schools to get these signatures. He concluded by reiterating the declaration which he had formerly made, that the people of the White Hills were united in supporting the *just rights of the South* on this question.’

That this last declaration of Mr. Pierce was substantially correct, is now demonstrated by the recent adoption of the following resolution by the House of Representatives of New Hampshire—Ayes 124, Noes 21 :

‘ Resolved, That Congress cannot, without a violation of the public faith, abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, unless upon the request of the citizens of that District, and of *the States by whom that territory was ceded to the General Government.*’

In the Senate, the vote stood Ayes 11, Noes 1.

Mr. JARVIS, of Maine, offered the following resolution :

‘ Resolved, That in the opinion of this House, the subject of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia ought not to be entertained by Congress ; and be it further resolved, that in case any petition praying for said abolition be hereafter presented, it is the deliberate opinion of this House, that the same ought to be laid upon the table, without being referred or printed.’

Mr. JARVIS said—

‘ In his opinion, the House was bound to do all which it was necessary to do, to dissipate the fears, however groundless they may be, that Congress entertained any idea of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia. A large majority of the States, and of *the people of the North*, were, he believed, averse to the exercise by Congress of *any power over slavery in this District*. Of other States it did not become him to speak so well as of his own—but the people of Maine, without distinction of party, reprobated the measures of the abolitionists, and of those also who sought to agitate the question, by urging the abolition of slavery in this District.’

Mr. BEARDSLEY of New York said—

‘ There was no use in spending another day on this subject. If the petition was laid on the table, *it would be nailed there*, and every succeeding petition would be disposed of in the same way.’

Mr. VANDERPOOL of New York said—

“ He was opposed, openly and unconditionally opposed, to the interference of Congress with slavery in the District of Columbia. He would always, and forever, while he had a seat

here, oppose any measure that might directly or indirectly favor, or forward, or countenance the views and objects expressed by such petitions. Why not march directly to the point upon which all the true enemies of the abolitionists would agree? *Refuse to consider the petitions*, and you do what should be done, and that in the most prompt manner. It would be telling the petitioners, the nation, and the world, that the notions of the petitioners were so heretical, and their doings were so mischievous and incendiary, that *co-instanti* that such petitions were read, we would consign them to a grave from which there should be no resurrection.'

Mr. HUNT of New York said—

'If gentlemen will take the trouble to look at the proceedings of the District I have the honor to represent, they will see that on all occasions I have opposed the efforts which are termed, and by many thought to be, incendiary.'

Mr. SUTHERLAND of Pa. said—

'He believed that there was no man in the House whose mind was more decided on this subject than his own. He lived in a State where slavery was formerly tolerated, and which had abolished slavery; and a State where all the projects of the abolitionists were utterly despised and disregarded; and he was prepared to go all lengths which honor and justice required in maintaining the rights of the South, and discountenancing the schemes of fanaticism.'

Mr. INGERSOLL of Pa. said—

'He was opposed to meddling, either directly or indirectly, in any shape, with slavery in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere. We entered into a compact, when we formed the Constitution, not to meddle with it (!)—He would live up to the agreement, though the heavens fell. He would live by it, and die by it.'

The importance of this subject must be the apology for these numerous extracts. They clearly show who are the defenders of the 'CITADEL' of American slavery, and upon whom rests the guilt of imbruting the image of God, and making merchandize of souls—the *people of the Northern States!* They also illustrate another point—and that is, if slavery is ever to be abolished in the District of Columbia, a very large portion of the present northern members of Congress MUST BE LEFT AT

HOME, and better men, having hearts of flesh, sent in their stead, or else it will be a mockery any longer to petition. While, however, so large a majority of northern representatives were recreant to GOD and LIBERTY, it is with pride and pleasure we add, that the entire delegation from Massachusetts were found true to the rights of their constituents, as also those from Rhode Island and Vermont. Among those who deserve to be honorably mentioned, in this connexion, with special emphasis, are Messrs. Adams, Cushing, and Hoar, of this State, and Mr. Slade of Vermont.

NUMBER OF PETITIONERS.

Mr. Pinckney represented the whole number of memorials, presented at the last session, to be 176—the number of signatures, a little rising 34,000, nearly 15,000 of whom were females. Not much reliance can be placed upon the accuracy of this representation. Probably not less than 500 memorials were forwarded, containing not less than 75,000 or 100,000 signatures. It is not to be supposed that a Committee so hostile to the prayer of the petitioners, so desirous to make them a contemptible body, *would condescend to count minutely and accurately the number of petitions and signatures*, either for the sake of doing them justice, or revealing their real strength.—Early in the session, it was estimated by Washington letter-writers, that not less than 300 petitions had been already forwarded; and it is certain that, so numerous did they continue to come in, *the order of calling the States was reversed in the House*, (in order to obstruct their presentation,) beginning with Michigan instead of Maine. Assuming, however, that the whole number of petitioners was 34,000, as stated by Mr. Pinckney, seldom has so large a number ever asked the action of Congress upon any subject whatever. We now come to the

ACTION OF CONGRESS UPON THE PETITIONS.

In the Senate, none of the petitions were referred. A memorial of the Caln Quarterly Meeting of the Society of Friends,

having been read, was immediately rejected by a vote of 34 to 6—that is, 17 States out of 20, by their Senators, sided with the oppressor. The two Senators from Massachusetts voted against the rejection; but not a single Senator, from any of the States, expressed any desire for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, at any period however remote. *Let this fact be kept in remembrance by the people.*

In the House of Representatives, after an ardent discussion, on motion of Mr. Pinckney of S. C., a resolution was adopted by a vote of 163 to 47,—‘That in the opinion of this House, Congress ought not to interfere, *in any way*, with slavery in the District of Columbia;’ and a committee of nine chosen, and ordered to report to the effect, that such interference ‘would be a violation of public faith, unwise, impolitic, and dangerous to the Union.’ This committee consisted of Mr. Pinckney of S. C., Mr. Hamer of Ohio, Mr. Pierce of N. H., Mr. Hardin of Ky., Mr. Jarvis of Me., Mr. Owens of Geo., Mr. Muhlenberg of Pa., Mr. Dromgoole of Va., and Mr. Turrill of N. Y.—a MAJORITY, therefore, from the *free States*. The appointment of such a committee, clothed with such instructions, is startling evidence that a large majority of the people of the free States *are not opposed in principle to slavery, and deprecate its abolition*, even in the capital of the nation, unless indeed they have been grossly misrepresented by their representatives. Prior to the adoption of the resolution alluded to, Mr. Pinckney said—‘He firmly believed that, if it were adopted, the House would succeed in putting down all fanaticism.’ The resolution *was* adopted, as we have seen. How much ‘fanaticism’ it has put down, is not known; but the inundation of Congress, at its present session, with anti-slavery memorials, must convince Mr. Pinckney, that the spirit of abolition has survived not only the resolution of the House, but his own Report. Justly did Mr. Hammond exclaim—‘For what purpose was the Report to be made? Would it arrest the career of fanaticism? Had not the most able arguments been made on this subject, without effect? Was there any thing in a report from Congress, which would give our arguments on this subject any magical effect? It

would be considered *as mere waste paper.*' The prophecy is fulfilled to the letter. Mr. Pinckney's Report, though painfully elaborate and formidably long, is justly 'considered as mere waste paper.' On its presentation, Mr. Thompson of S. C. declared, that 'a more stale combination of argument without reason, and jesuitical sophistry, he had never seen; and he thought it ought to be burnt by the common hangman.' This denunciation was bestowed upon it, because Mr. Pinckney was not hardy enough to maintain, that Congress had *not* exclusive jurisdiction over the District, in all cases whatsoever. In self-defence, Mr. P. said—'If the question should be pressed to a vote, a majority, he thought, would sustain the right of Congress to interfere on the subject of slavery in the District. It had been his wish to avoid the inevitable and disastrous results which such a vote must produce.' Mr. Wise of Va. said—'If southern men were to agree to that report, they were gone, swept away. *There was not an inch of ground left for them to stand upon.*' Mr. A. H. Sheppard said—'The report conceded every thing. It conceded the principle, that Congress had a right to interfere in the question of slavery in the District, and that was *conceding the whole.*' According, therefore, to the views of the most determined enemies of the abolition cause, the abolitionists are sustained by Congress, on the ground of right, in asking for the overthrow of slavery in the District: and yet that body refuses to give their petitions a respectful consideration!

The fatal assumption in the report of Mr. Pinckney,—the corner-stone upon which he erects his pro-slavery edifice,—is, that SLAVES ARE NOT MEN, but cattle, property, articles of merchandize, not only according to the law of the land, but in strict equity, according to the law of God. Hence, from such premises, he naturally arrives at the conclusion, that no legislative body has a right to deprive men of their property, at least not without their consent, or returning a *quid pro quo*. But the premises being false, the conclusion falls to the ground—and,

'——— like the baseless fabric of a vision,
Leaves not a wreck behind.'

Nothing can exceed the assurance of Mr. Pinckney, or of Congress, in taking for granted, as a sound proposition, the most preposterous, the most impious of all fallacies, that man can justly be the property, estate, chattel, beast of burden, of his fellow-man ; when both Mr. Pinckney and Congress clearly understand, that abolitionists deny the proposition as abhorrent to reason, humanity and revelation, and triumphantly sustain the ground they occupy by all that is immortal in man—by the concurrent approval of the whole world—by summoning, as witnesses, God who created man in his own image, Christ who died to redeem him, the Holy Ghost by whom he is sanctified !

Thus, the very point of disputation, the hinge upon which the controversy turns, the sole and single cause of the mighty difference between the abolitionists and their opponents, is carefully evaded throughout the Report. What is it, then, but ‘mere waste paper’?—deliberate blasphemy against the Most High God?—an insult to the common sense of mankind? *In adopting it, Congress virtually rescinded the Declaration of Independence*, and stamped the ‘self-evident truths’ of that great instrument, as ‘splendid absurdities,’ as mere ‘rhetorical flourishes.’

But the Report, in the most conclusive manner, refutes its own reasoning, and confirms the great truths set forth in the speeches, writings and memorials of the abolitionists. To prove this assertion, let a single extract suffice. ‘The Constitution,’ says Mr. Pinckney, ‘while it confers upon Congress exclusive legislation within this District, does not, and could not, confer *unlimited despotic authority over it.*’ True: how then does Congress dare to keep in chains and servitude, a fourth of the inhabitants of the District? It can neither sanction nor tolerate slavery in the territory over which it holds jurisdiction, without violating the Constitution. Again, says Mr. P.:—‘It [the Constitution] could confer no power contrary to the fundamental principles of the Constitution itself, and the essential and unalienable rights of American citizens.’ What are those principles? ‘*To establish justice, to promote the general wel-*

fare, and SECURE THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY.'

What are those rights? A right to life, liberty, property.— Again :—' The right to legislate, therefore, (to make the Constitution consistent with itself,) is evidently qualified by the provision, that "no man shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due form of law," and others of similar character.' Then, most certainly, the slaves in the District, having been deprived of liberty and property without any charge of crime or form of law, are entitled to freedom and compensation without delay. Again : ' There are certain *vital principles* in our free, republican Government, which will determine and overrule an apparent and flagrant abuse of legislative power; as to authorize manifest injustice [making human beings goods and chattels] by positive law, or to take away that security for *personal liberty* or private property, for the protection whereof the Government was established.'—' A law that makes a man a judge in his own case, [whether his fettered victim is prepared for freedom]—or a law that takes property away from A, [takes a man from the possession of his own body, intellect and soul,] and gives it to B. It is against all reason and justice for a people to entrust a legislature with such powers, and therefore *it cannot be presumed that they have done it.*'—' The legislature cannot change innocence into guilt, [man-stealing into honesty,] or punish innocence [a colored skin] as a crime.'

Thus summarily and conclusively does this famous Report ridicule its own folly, refute its own reasoning, and establish what it attempts to overthrow. It is thus that God 'taketh the wise in their own craftiness, and carrieth the counsels of the froward headlong.'

Early in the present session of Congress, abolition petitions began to be forwarded in great numbers from various parts of the country. Much anxiety was felt as to the course that would be pursued by the House. As usual, Mr. Adams was the first to 'beard the lion in his den,' by presenting a petition from his constituents. Objections being made to its reception, on account of the decision of the House at the former session, the

Speaker (contrary to general expectation) decided, that the rule expired with the session. It was then that a representative from a FREE State, Mr. DAVIS of Indiana, moved, that all memorials that might be presented on the subject of slavery in the District, be laid upon the table, without reading, without reference, without discussion! It was not a member from the South, it was a member from *free Indiana*, who made this daring proposal! So hostile is the spirit of the free States to the abolition of slavery within the capital of the Union! Though this motion was at first rejected, it was afterward adopted by a very large majority, when offered by a southern representative, in the following shape :

‘ Resolved, That all petitions, memorials, resolutions, propositions, or papers, relating in any way, or to any extent, whatever, to the subject of slavery, or the abolition of slavery, shall, without being either printed or referred, be laid on the table, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon.’

Thus the House of Representatives of the United States have dared to do an act, which, if done by the British Parliament, would create a revolution throughout all England! It is nothing less than denying the sacred right of the people to petition the government. What are irresponsible mobs, what the robbing of the public mail, what the administration of lynch law by an infuriated rabble, compared to the act of trampling upon the right of petition, by the representatives of a free people? What is most to be deprecated is, that while the right was pretendedly acknowledged *in form*, it was really denied *in spirit*. Friends of your country! sons of the Pilgrims! freemen of Massachusetts! where are your liberties? Was it for this that your fathers battled unto death upon Bunker’s Hill? and fertilized the plains of Lexington and Concord with their blood? What then have you inherited that is worth possessing? What have you gained by exchanging a monarchical government for a slaveholding despotism? And who are putting chains upon your bodies—a seal upon your lips—the brand of SLAVES upon your cheeks? Your own Senators and Representatives! Will any man pretend, that this is not so? that the right of pe-

tion is still held sacred? that the memorials of the people have been respectfully treated? What! is insult to be added to injury? mockery to oppression? Of what value is the right of petition—what is it but a solemn farce—if the petitions of the people are not permitted to be read, referred, and acted upon with all deliberation and impartiality? This is the climax of tyranny. It is conceding the liberty of speech, by cutting out the tongue; it is admitting the rights of conscience, by stretching the victim upon the rack of the inquisition; it is allowing full sovereignty to the people, by scoffing at their remonstrances, contemning their authority, and stifling their voice! And this is the fruit of American slavery: it is done, that one-sixth portion of the American people may be held as brute beasts, and heathenism perpetuated in the land!

Behold our condition! Is it asked, what shall be done? What will the people of Massachusetts do when tyrants attempt to gag them? Why, cry aloud, and spare not! What will they do when their rights are invaded? Why, resist the invasion with weapons tempered in the fire of Heaven—spiritual weapons which are mighty through God. What will they do when a bold conspiracy is forming to put them into bondage? They will blow the trumpet of alarm long and loud, and struggle mightily against it with all the resistless energies of men who know that

‘——— a day, an hour of virtuous liberty,
Is worth a whole eternity of bondage.’

What will they do when they see the American Constitution trampled in the dust? They will raise it up and proudly defend it, curbing the despotism of its usurpers, and making it indeed the *Ægis* to protect the rights of every man, in every part of the country. What will they do when they behold **LIBERTY** faint, bleeding, prostrate, overpowered by her most sanguinary foes? They will rush to her rescue, rally their forces together, and stand shoulder to shoulder in the conflict. What will they do when they see God dishonored, and Virtue crucified, and Oppression rampant, and Anarchy stalking through

the land? Why, they will act as becomes men, and patriots, and Christians—and act **IMMEDIATELY**.

‘ Now, when our land to ruin’s brink is verging,
 In God’s name, let us speak while there is time !
 Now, when the padlocks for our lips are forging,
SILENCE is CRIME !

Shall our New England stand erect no longer,
 But stoop in chains upon her downward way,
 Thicker to gather on her limbs and stronger
 Day after day ?

O no ; at once from all her wild green mountains—
 From valleys where her slumbering fathers lie—
 From her blue rivers and her welling fountains,
 And clear, cold sky :

From her rough coast, and isles, which hungry ocean
 Gnaws with his surges—from the fisher’s skiff,
 With white sail swaying to the billows’ motion
 Round rock and cliff :

From the free fire-side of her unbought farmer—
 From the free laborer at his loom and wheel—
 From the brown smith-shop, where beneath the hammer
 Rings the red steel :

From each and all, if God hath not forsaken
 Our land, and left us to an evil choice,
 Loud as the summer thunder-bolt shall waken
A PEOPLE’S VOICE !

But the voice of the people must be raised, not merely against the denial of the right of petition by Congress, but against that oppressive system *which alone has caused this sacred right to be taken away*—or else **THEY WILL SPEAK IN VAIN**. It is useless to think of protesting against a legitimate *effect*, and leaving the *cause* of that effect to continue in full operation. Why are not the petitions of the people received by Congress? Because slavery exists in the District of Columbia. Why is not freedom of speech tolerated upon the floor of Congress? Because it is incompatible with the perpetuity of slavery in that District. Shall the right of petition and the freedom of speech be destroyed, that the foulest oppression may flourish with impunity?

MR. CALHOUN'S REPORT.

In the U. S. Senate, on the 4th of February, 1836, Mr. CALHOUN made a Report from the Select Committee to whom was referred that portion of the President's Message which related to the attempts to circulate, through the mail, inflammatory appeals, to excite slaves to insurrection. Next to the Message upon which it was predicated, this Report ought to have excited in the minds of the people, the liveliest emotions of astonishment and alarm ; but neither of them disturbed the slavish repose of the nation, nor elicited a single burst of indignation from any body of men but the abolitionists. Nothing but the most ready acquiescence in the enslavement of our colored countrymen, and the basest subserviency to southern dictation, and the fiercest malevolence towards the friends of universal freedom, could have tolerated even for a moment the despotic recommendation of the President, that Congress should pass laws prohibiting, under severe penalties, the circulation in the Southern States, through the mails, of anti-slavery publications. Such a proposition,—scorning as it does the protection given to the freedom of the press by the Constitution,—under other circumstances, and with reference to any other people pining in bondage, would have convulsed all the political and moral elements in the land, and created a hurricane excitement even to the borders of the Pacific ocean.

The Report of Mr. CALHOUN is distinguished for perverse ingenuity and laborious folly ; and the conclusion at which it arrives is absolute despotism and sheer robbery, giving to deputy postmasters, mail-carriers, and other officers and agents of the Post Office Department, authority to destroy or abstract from the mail, ‘ any pamphlet, newspaper, handbill, or other paper, printed or *written*, or pictorial representation, *touching* the subject of slavery, addressed to any person or post-office in any state, territory, or district, where, by the laws of said state, territory, or district, their circulation is prohibited ’ !—Of course, this license entirely destroys the sanctity of the public mail, and, as it extends to written as well as printed communications,

subjects all letters, whether on business or friendship, whether containing drafts or money, to the espionage of any person or persons connected with any branch of the Post Office Department! And the reason adduced why this destructive privilege should be granted is, lest these letters or documents should contain some direct or indirect remarks, merely '*touching*' the subject of slavery!

Monstrous as this proposition appears, and suicidal as this mode of suppressing all discussions of slavery would be, the Report was passed to a third reading by a vote of 18 to 18—Mr. Van Buren giving the casting vote in the affirmative—and rejected by the Senate, on its passage to be engrossed, by a vote of only 19 to 25! Mr. DAVIS of this State was on the committee with Mr. Calhoun, and merely expressed his dissent from the Report in some tame and indefinite remarks. 'There were some portions of it which met with his approbation, but other portions there were, [why did he not specify them?] in which he did not concur. He made this statement, lest his views might be misunderstood. [A very lucid explanation, truly!] He knew that he might have placed his views on the subject in writing before the world, but he had not deemed them of sufficient importance (!)—he did not think the world thought them of sufficient importance.' Had it been a Bill for the repeal of the Tariff before the Senate, reported by Mr. CALHOUN, it is more than probable that Mr. DAVIS would have deemed his own views of 'sufficient importance' to have uttered them freely, in warm and eloquent language. Like one of old, he would have said—'I will also show my opinion;' and that opinion would have been expressed with becoming plainness. But a Bill, designed to violate both the letter and spirit of the American Constitution—to make it lawful, and even obligatory, to plunder the public mail of its contents—to destroy all communication between the several States, and fill the land with confusion and distress—this was not of 'sufficient importance' to arouse the eloquence or startle the security of the Senator from Massachusetts! Nevertheless, he deserves some praise even

for his comparatively feeble opposition to the Report ; for other Senators from the free States refrained from uttering a single word of disapprobation—nay, several voted in favor of it when the question was upon its passage to be engrossed !—Mr. WEBSTER, the boasted ‘ Defender of the Constitution,’ was not wholly dumb, but inexcusably deficient in earnestness and power. It was an occasion that should have witnessed his noblest effort in the cause of constitutional liberty. He should have promptly flung himself into ‘ the imminent deadly breach,’ for the preservation of the dearest rights of the people. But he evidently quailed before the fierce spirit of slavery. The Report had been read once, twice, thrice—and yet he had not spoken ! Just as the final vote was to be taken, he ventured to express his dissent. But how did he speak ? Like one who saw and felt that the liberties of the country were at stake, and the Union itself threatened with instant dissolution ? LIKE HIMSELF ? Did he thunder ? did he lighten ? Did he cry, ‘ *To the Rescue !* ’—and, not waiting for support, rush into the thickest of the conflict, single-handed ? No. ‘ Mr. Webster objected to the bill partly on account of the extraordinary vagueness of its language, but principally, because the effect of the bill was to abridge the liberty of the press.’ But, he manifested no amazement, no indignation, no grief, at the audacity which had presumed to introduce such a bill for the adoption of the Senate.

Although the Report was rejected, it deserves at least a slight examination ; for the majority against it was small, and it may be renewed with better success at another session of Congress. All danger from that source is not over, and it is the part of true wisdom to be prepared for the worst.

The ground assumed by Mr. CALHOUN is, first, that Congress cannot pass any law abridging the liberty of the press. This position he finds no difficulty in sustaining, because the language of the Constitution is explicit upon this subject. But he assumes, in the second place, that what Congress may not do, under any pretext whatever, each Legislature of the several States

may do, whenever they shall deem it necessary,—namely, MUZZLE THE PRESS, and *destroy its liberty!* Nay, one State has not only a right, for instance, to prohibit the circulation of anti-slavery publications within its limits, but it is the duty of every other State to make the printing of such publications within its own limits a criminal offence, to be visited with pains and penalties!

We place the arguments in juxta-position, that they may be seen at a glance :

‘Congress has not the power to pass such a law: it would be a violation of one of the most sacred provisions of the Constitution.’—‘The jealous spirit of liberty which characterized our ancestors at the period when the Constitution was adopted, forever closed the door by which the right might be implied from any of the granted powers, or any other source, if there be any other.’—‘The amended article of the Constitution, among other things, provides that Congress shall pass no law which shall abridge the liberty of the press—a provision which interposes an insuperable objection to the measure recommended by the President.’—‘Among the many objections to the adoption of the Constitution, none were more successfully urged than the absence in the instrument of those general provisions which experience has shown to be necessary to *guard the outworks of liberty*: such as the *freedom of the press and of speech, the rights of conscience*, of trial by jury, and others. It was the belief of those jealous and watchful guardians of liberty, who viewed the adoption of the Constitution with so much apprehension, that all those sacred barriers, without some positive provision to protect them, would, by the power of centralization, be undermined and prostrate.’—‘The object of publishing is circulation; and to prohibit circulation is in effect to prohibit publication.’—‘Nothing is more clear than that the admission of the right, on the part of Congress, to determine what papers are incendiary, and, as such, to prohibit their circulation through the mail, necessarily involves the right to determine what are not incendiary, and to enforce their circulation. Nor is it less certain that to admit such a right would be virtually to *clothe Congress with the power to abolish slavery*, by giving it the means of breaking down all the barriers which the slaveholding States have erected for the protection of their lives and property.’

‘It belongs to the States, and not to Congress, to determine what is, or is not, calculated to disturb their peace and security; and of course, in the case under consideration, it belongs to the slaveholding States to determine what is incendiary and intended to incite to insurrection, and to adopt such defensive measures as may be necessary for their security, with unlimited means of carrying them into effect, except such as may be expressly inhibited to the States by the Constitution.’—‘The right of a State to defend itself against internal dangers is a part of the great, primary, and inherent right of self-defence, which, by the laws of nature, belongs to all communities.’—‘Rights and duties are reciprocal—the existence of a right always implying a corresponding duty. If, consequently, the right to protect her internal peace and security belongs to a State, the General Government is bound to respect the measures [abridging the freedom of speech and of the press!] adopted by her for that purpose, and to co-operate in their execution, as far as its delegated powers may admit, or the measure may require. Thus, in the present case, the slaveholding States having the *unquestionable* (?) right to pass all such laws as may be necessary to maintain the EXISTING RELATION between MASTER and SLAVE in those States, their right, of course, to prohibit the circulation of any publication, or any intercourse calculated to disturb or destroy that relation, is incontrovertible.’—‘Within their limits, the rights of the slaveholding States are as full to demand of the States within whose limits and jurisdiction their peace is assailed, to adopt the measures necessary to prevent the same, and, if refused or neglected, to resort to means to protect themselves, as if they were separate and independent communities.’

It is perfectly obvious, that Mr. CALHOUN is not less justly chargeable with the folly of self-confutation than Mr. PINCKNEY. His argument proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. The theory which he advances is the theory of NULLIFICATION: it makes the subordinate, paramount—the inferior, superior—the single digit greater than the entire aggregate—the satellite, the central sun! For,

1. It absurdly assumes, that though Congress may not pass a law which shall be binding upon the several States, the Legislature of South Carolina is invested with such power!

2. That the liberty of the press,—and, by parity of reasoning, the freedom of speech, the rights of conscience, and trial by jury,—may be either abridged or wholly taken away, under pains and penalties, by any State Legislature, not only in reference to the inhabitants of said State, but of all the States!

3. That a State Legislature, in a free republic, has power over the liberties of the people, superior to that which is granted to the British Parliament!—for that body cannot shackle the press, except by usurpation.

4. That the Constitution of the United States expressly prohibits Congress from infringing upon the liberty of the press, simply because the right belongs exclusively to each State Legislature!—Of what value, then, is this great instrument? It becomes truly ‘a blurred and tattered parchment.’ For if the freedom of speech and of the press, upon any subject whatever, may rightfully and at any moment be destroyed by the Legislature of a single State, and the act must be respected and obeyed by the people of every other State, there can be nothing left in the shape of liberty, to be protected by the Constitution.—An absolute despotism would reign over the land. In the days of our colonial vassalage, such power was never claimed by the mother country. Have not our fathers spilt their blood in vain?

But let us hear Mr. CALHOUN once more:

‘If it be admitted that Congress has the right to discriminate in reference to their character, what papers shall or what papers shall not be transmitted by the mail, it would subject the freedom of the press, on all subjects, political, moral and religious,

completely to its will and pleasure. It would, in fact, in some respects, more effectually control the freedom of the press than any sedition law, however severe its penalties. The mandate of the Government alone would be sufficient to close the door against circulation through the mail, and thus, at its will and pleasure, might intercept all communication between the press and the people; while it would require the intervention of courts and juries to enforce the provisions of a sedition law, which experience has shown are not always passive and willing instruments in the hands of Government, where the freedom of the press is concerned.*

But 'if it be admitted that' a State Legislature 'has a right to discriminate,' &c. &c. as in the case above supposed, surely the same disastrous results and absurd conclusions must follow. No matter by what body this right shall be exercised: the consequences would be equally fatal to all political and religious freedom.

Surely, Mr. CALHOUN will not claim more power for the Legislature of South Carolina, than he is willing to concede to the Legislature of Massachusetts; nor will he deny, that the people of New-England place as high an estimate upon liberty, as the people of the South do upon slavery. Doctrines which are subversive of human rights are as repugnant to the former, as are the doctrines which conflict with the divine right of slaveholding to the latter. Now, in order to give perpetuity to southern slavery, Mr. CALHOUN boldly affirms, that an act of the Legislature of South Carolina, prohibiting the printing or circulating of *anti-slavery* views or sentiments* within the limits of that State, is binding upon every other State: hence the call of certain slaveholding States, during the past year, upon the Legislatures of the free States, to suppress by penal enactments, anti-slavery publications and meetings. It follows, therefore, that if the Legislature of Massachusetts should make a law, prohibiting the printing or circulating of any *pro-slavery* views or sentiments within its territory, and thereby excluding all

* Such as the following, for example:—'God commands, and all nature cries out, that man should not be held as property. The system of making men property has plunged 2,250,000 of our fellow-countrymen into the deepest physical and moral degradation, and they are every moment sinking deeper.'—For this expression, R. G. Williams of New-York, publisher of the *Emancipator*, has been indicted by a Grand Jury in Alabama, as 'being a wicked, malicious, seditious and ill-disposed person,' and on the strength of which indictment Gov. Gayle has demanded Mr. Williams of Gov. Marcy! !

southern newspapers from the State,—it would be equally binding upon all the slaveholding States ; for, ‘ if the right to protect her internal peace and security belongs to a State, the General Government is bound to respect the measures adopted by her for that purpose, and to co-operate in their execution ’ ! *

But would Mr. CALHOUN, or Mr. McDUFFIE, or the State of South Carolina, submit to such a law ? Would they class it among the ‘ reserved rights ’ of the old Bay State ?—So, too, with regard to any other subject, upon which there may happen to be conflicting views and interests between the several States. If its discussion be prohibited by any one of the twenty-six States, the remaining twenty-five are obligated to be dumb and submissive !

The Report, under consideration, bestows the following panegyric upon the ‘ relation ’ between masters and slaves :

‘ It is against this relation between the two races, that the blind and criminal zeal of the abolitionists is directed—a relation that now preserves in quiet and security, more than 6,500,000 human beings ’ (! !)—‘ Under this relation, the two races have long lived in peace and prosperity, and, if not disturbed, would long continue so to live ’ (! !)—‘ It may be safely asserted, that there is no example in history, in which a savage people, such as the ancestors of the slaves were when brought into the country, have ever advanced in the same period so rapidly in numbers and *improvement* ’ (! !)

The ‘ relation ’ which is producing so much happiness, safety, improvement, peace, prosperity, &c. &c. is the relation of one man as a beast, to another man as his absolute owner ! If such really be its beneficent results, it will certainly bear the test of a most rigid scrutiny ; and it is difficult to perceive, why the South should be so angry when we propose to discuss its utility, or why she should require us to preserve unbroken silence !—The solution of this delicate enigma is, that what is affirmed of this ‘ relation ’ in the Report, is obviously false, in every particular. The slave system is full of the elements of self-destruction : it is a moral Vesuvius—within are raging fires—without

* In proof of which, Mr. Calhoun gravely adduces the act of Congress of February, 1799, respecting quarantine and health laws (! !)—which, among other things, ‘ directs the collectors and all other revenue officers, the masters and crews of revenue cutters, and the military officers in command of the station, to co-operate faithfully in the execution of the quarantine and other restrictions which the health laws of the State may establish.’ A very rare analogy !

is desolation, the awful consequence of successive volcanic eruptions, wherever its lava tide has flowed. And ‘the end is not yet.’

Again :

‘The blindness of fanaticism is proverbial. With more zeal than understanding, it constantly misconceives the nature of the object at which it aims, and toward which it rushes with headlong violence, regardless of the means by which it is effected.—Never was its character more fully exemplified than in the present instance. Setting out with the abstract principle that slavery is an evil, the fanatical zealots come at once to the conclusion that it is their duty to abolish it, regardless of the disasters which must follow. Never was conclusion more false or dangerous.’

Behold the folly and insanity of the abolitionists ! If this be an accurate delineation of their character, it is a poor compliment which Mr. CALHOUN pays to the intelligence, patriotism and piety of the North, to argue that, unless they are put down BY FORCE, the abolitionists can never be vanquished by reason, but will assuredly enlist the people on their side ! Fanaticism is quickly consumed by its own fire: its ‘blindness’ ensures its speedy self-destruction. It was one of the best and most popular sentiments ever uttered by Mr. JEFFERSON, that ‘error of opinion may be safely tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it.’ ‘The fanatical zealots’ stigmatized by Mr. CALHOUN, do not merely call slavery an ‘evil,’ but they brand it as a *sin*—A SYSTEM OF INIQUITIES—one vast aggregation of heaven-daring impieties ; and they therefore know that its immediate abandonment is a duty, which wisely and unerringly regards all imaginable consequences, all real interests, whether near or remote, whether appertaining to the few or the many, to the present or the future, to time or to eternity ! But they have never been guilty of the folly ascribed to them in the Report,—of asserting that it is ‘*their duty*’ to abolish slavery in the southern States: that ‘*duty*’ must be performed by the slaveholders themselves.

It is a relief to know wherein the essential wickedness of the abolitionists consists. According to Mr. CALHOUN, it is found alike in the *end* aimed at by them, and in the *means* used to effect that end.

‘Wicked and cruel as is the end aimed at, it is fully equalled by the criminality of the means by which it is proposed to be accomplished. These consist in organized societies and a powerful press, directed mainly with a view to excite the bitterest animosity and hatred of the people of the non-slaveholding States against the citizens and institutions of the slaveholding States. It is easy to see to what disastrous results such means must tend.’—‘The incessant action of hundreds of societies, and a vast printing establishment, throwing out, daily, thousands of artful and inflammatory publications, must make in time a deep impression on the section of the Union where they freely circulate, and are mainly designed to have effect. The well-informed and thoughtful hold them in contempt, but the young, the inexperienced, the ignorant, and thoughtless, will receive the poison.’

Upon the above extract we remark—

1. They who oppose the abolitionists, but argue in favor of the *ultimate* abolition of slavery as a most desirable ‘end,’—as if such a view of the question would be perfectly agreeable to the holders of slaves,—are thus admonished by Mr. CALHOUN, that such an abolition, at any period however remote, or under any circumstances however favorable, would be ‘wicked’ and ‘cruel.’*

2. The organization of societies and the establishment of ‘a powerful press,’ are not proofs of ‘the criminality of the means’ adopted by the abolitionists; for they are invariably resorted to by the friends of every benevolent, just and holy enterprise, as essential to its success. Without organized action, and without a press, what progress could be made in the cause of Temperance, of Peace, or of Religion? What could the Bible, or Missionary, or Education Societies do without them?

3. If the abolition press throws out, daily, ‘thousands of artful and inflammatory publications,’ this may be a sound reason why the anti-abolition press should throw out, daily, tens of thousands of publications of an opposite tendency—but it cannot justify the plundering of the public mail, nor the destruction of the great palladium of human rights. If infidelity be

*The language of Gov. McDuffie is yet more emphatic than Mr. Calhoun’s:—‘No patriot who justly estimates our privileges, will tolerate the idea of emancipation, at any period however remote, or on any conditions of pecuniary advantage however favorable. I would as soon think of opening a negation for selling the liberty of the State at once, as for making any stipulations for the *ultimate* emancipation of our slaves.’—The Charleston Courier says:—‘We protest against the assumption, the unwarrantable assumption, that slavery is *ultimately* to be extirpated from the southern States. *Ultimate* abolitionists are enemies of the south, the same in kind, and only less in degree, than *immediate* abolitionists.’

zealous and daring in the dissemination of its poisonous sentiments, shame upon christianity if it be not as active in its own cause—shame upon it if it demand that infidelity shall be gagged, fettered, and crushed by force, instead of meeting it with those spiritual weapons which are mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strong holds!

4. The assertion, that ‘the well-informed and thoughtful’ hold the anti-slavery publications ‘in contempt,’ if true, would voluntarily place Mr. CALHOUN and his associates in the ranks of ‘the inexperienced, the ignorant and thoughtless’—for they regard these publications with far different feelings: they cannot despise that which excites so much consternation among themselves. If the assertion be true, then it is an insult to that enlightened and virtuous class even to hint, that there is danger of their being misled by those who have ‘more zeal than understanding,’ who are smitten with ‘the blindness of fanaticism,’ and who are ‘fanatical zealots.’ If the assertion be true, then all the mobs, riots and lynchings in the land, with reference to slavery, have been perpetrated by ‘the well-informed and thoughtful,’ and their unresisting victims have been ‘the inexperienced, the ignorant, and the thoughtless’!—But it is calumnious, and Mr. CALHOUN knows it to be so. If he really believed all that he says in favor of slavery, that it is as beneficent a system as exists under heaven,—and all that he says against the abolitionists, that they are ignorant, unprincipled, insane men,—would he tremble lest they should win over to their side the ‘wise and prudent,’ the pious and philanthropic?—Would he confess, that the delusion of a despised band would prove too powerful for the reason of the nation, unless they were put down by the strong arm of law? Or would he wax hot, and be thrown into a paroxysm of fury, the moment any individual should begin to investigate that system which he says is producing so much happiness and prosperity? His terror—his anger—his dread of examination—his opposition to free discussion—his call for judicial pains and penalties to be inflicted upon the persons of abolitionists on account of their *opinions*

—his willingness to shackle the press—his recommendation to make the robbery of the mail of any and every document, whether printed or oral, which merely ‘touches’ the subject of slavery, a lawful and *obligatory* act—all these evince a state of mind ill at ease, a conscience troubled with its own fearful monitions, an understanding filled with guilty confusion. How is the declaration of the Almighty confirmed to the letter !—‘ For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise ? where is the disputer of this world ? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world ? ’

Mr. CALHOUN, in the extremity of his argument, holds up the *lex talionis* over the heads of our northern citizens, *in terrorem*. He says, by way of solemn admonition :

‘ The sober and considerate portion of citizens of non-slaveholding States, who have a deep stake in the existing institutions of the country, would have little forecast not to see that the assaults which are now directed against the institutions of the southern States, may be very easily directed against those which uphold their own property and security ’ (! !)

The effect of this warning must be to relax the muscles and disturb the gravity of our ‘sober and considerate citizens’—nothing more. Does the Senator from South Carolina credit his own ridiculous assertion, that the same assaults which the abolitionists are making upon the slave system, may be directed against our northern FREE LABOR system ? If this could be done, what is there in the temper or disposition of the South toward the North, to make her forbear retaliating in the manner threatened ? Why has she descended to the vile and hopeless task of scourging, imprisoning or putting to death, without a trial, such abolitionists as have been identified upon her soil, when she holds such a potent weapon in her hands against the North, and can at any moment throw confusion among us by assailing our own institutions ? Is it not strange, that, among the numerous expedients devised by southern taskmasters to counteract the efforts of the abolitionists, they have not in a single instance attempted to prove,—by appealing to the Declaration of Independence and the Bible, by reasoning from anal-

ogy, by historical facts and arguments, by northern admissions and concessions, by 'the relation' of men and things established in nature,—that a New-England farmer has no moral right to hold his farm or his cattle as his property; that a New-England mechanic has no right to receive wages and obtain knowledge; that a New-England merchant commits an aggravated sin against God in buying and selling goods; that it is a violation of the seventh commandment for us to tolerate the marriage institution among our poor and ignorant population; that we are bringing upon this nation the reproach and derision of the world, and rendering it deserving of the judgments of heaven, by possessing houses and lands, rail-roads and manufactories, carriages and horses, ships and steamboats, &c. &c.; that we are outraging human rights in making, by law, no distinction between the rich and poor, the high and low, the strong and feeble; that we deserve to be execrated, in that we do not 'sell the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes,' but let every one possess his own body, mind and intellect, for his own benefit!!—Such warnings and remonstrances have never circulated north of the Potomac, nor fallen from the lips of any slaveholder south of Mason & Dixon's line: and if they should be addressed to us by our southern brethren, we pledge ourselves to receive them in good humor—not to get angry—not to threaten to dissolve the Union—not to lynch any of the remonstrants who may happen to sojourn with us—not to rob the U. S. mail—not to offer any rewards for the persons of southern planters—not to organize any vigilance committees—not to call upon the brute force of the nation to stand by us—not to stop our ears, and refuse to hear argument*—not to cut out the tongues of those who do not agree with us†—not to demand that the South shall

* 'Upon this subject we can hear no argument. Our opinions are unalterably fixed—our determinations are immutably firm and steadfast. It is a subject with which we cannot suffer a stranger to intermeddle.'—*Gov. Lumpkin's message, Georgia.*

† 'The question of slavery is not, and shall not be, open to discussion. The system is deep-rooted, and must remain forever. The very moment any individual attempts to lecture us upon its *evils* and *immorality*, and the necessity of putting means in operation to secure us from them, in the same moment his tongue shall be cut out and cast upon the dunghill.'—*Columbia S. C. Telescope.*

go to hanging a few thousands of our opponents, at the peril of losing our trade !! *

MR. CALHOUN speaks of 'the *impossibility* of abolishing the relation between MASTER and SLAVE without disasters unexampled in the history of the world'! And to show with what tenacity the slaveholding States cling to their oppression, he declares that

'Every consideration—interest, duty, and humanity—the love of country, the sense of wrong, HATRED OF OPPRESSORS, and treacherous and faithless confederates—and, finally, despair, would impel them to the most daring and desperate resistance in defence of property, family, country, LIBERTY, and existence'!!

Such is the anxiety of the South to get rid of the 'evil' of slavery!—Nothing can be more closely allied to mental and moral insanity, than the language of MR. CALHOUN, which affirms that '*duty—humanity—love of country*, and HATRED OF OPPRESSORS,' alike demand the perpetuation of a 'relation' wresting from more than one-third of the southern population all their rights, and reducing them to a level with the brute creation!—and which styles resistance to emancipation a 'defence of *property*, family, country, LIBERTY, and existence'!! Such a statesman ought to be held in execration,† (a slaveholder being witness,) and sent to Bedlam rather than to the Senate of the United States. Besides the atrocity of these sentiments of the Report, there is something extremely ridiculous in the intimation, that 'despair' will impel the slaveholders 'to the most *daring and desperate* resistance' to the arguments, entreaties and rebukes of the abolitionists!

One other extract, and we have done: and this intimately concerns the workingmen, mechanics and farmers of New-England:

* 'The people of the North must go to hanging these fanatical wretches, if they would not lose the benefit of southern trade—and they will do it. They know too well on which side their bread is buttered ever to give up these advantages, so long as the hanging of a few thousands will prevent it.'—*Richmond Whig*.

† 'With what *execration* should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one half the citizens to trample on the rights of the others, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroying the morals of the one part, and the amor patrie of the other!'—*Thomas Jefferson*.

'It would be well for those interested to reflect, whether there now exists, or ever has existed, a wealthy and civilized community, in which one portion did not live on the labor of another; and whether the form in which slavery exists in the South is not but one modification of this universal condition. . . Let those who are interested remember that labor is the only source of wealth, and how small a portion of it, in all old and civilized countries, even the best governed, is left to those by whose labor wealth is created. Let them also reflect how little volition or agency the operatives in any country have in the question of its distribution—as little, with a few exceptions, as the African of the slaveholding States has in the distribution of the proceeds of his labor.'

The *morality* of this argument is, that, because the laboring classes in the old despotic countries of Europe have long been deprived of just remuneration for their labor, therefore it is right for American REPUBLICANS and CHRISTIANS, who hold to the '*self-evident*' truth that all men are created equal, to plunder and keep in chains as many of their countrymen as possible! This, however, is merely a repetition of the bold avowal of GEORGE McDUFFIE, that 'slavery supersedes the necessity of *an order of nobility*, and all the other appendages of a hereditary system of government'—or, in other words, if the slaveholders were not enabled to prey upon their colored victims, so strongly bent are they upon robbery and oppression, they would endeavor to establish a government like that of Austria or Russia, and subject the working classes to the yoke of servitude, without regard to the complexion of the skin! Nay, it is prophesied by southern statesmen, that, within twenty-five years, the North will be necessitated to enslave its FREE LABORING POPULATION, or be destroyed by anarchy! And this is American republicanism!

A NEW SLAVE STATE.

At the last session of Congress, a Bill for the admission of Arkansas into the Union was adopted by both houses with very slight opposition,* notwithstanding the following article in its

* The question on the passage of the Bill stood as follows:—

YEAS—Messrs. Benton, Brown, Buchanan, Calhoun, Cuthbert, Ewing (of Illinois,) Ewing (of Ohio,) Grundy, Hendricks, Hill, Hubbard, King (of Alabama,) King (of Georgia,) Linn, McKean, Mangum, Morris, Nicholas, Niles, Preston, Rives, Robinson, Ruggles, Shepley, Tallmadge, Tipton, Walker, White, Wright—29.

NAYS—Messrs. Clay, Knight, Porter, Prentiss, Robbins, Swift—6.

In the House of Representatives, the vote stood—Yeas 143; Nays 50.

Constitution, which expressly prohibits the abolition of slavery in that State by the General Assembly :—

‘The General Assembly shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves, *without the consent of the owners*. They shall have no power to prevent emigrants to this State from bringing with them such persons as are deemed SLAVES by the laws of any one of the United States. They shall have power to pass laws to permit the owners of slaves to emancipate them, saving the right of creditors, and preventing them from becoming a public charge. They shall have power to prevent slaves from being brought to this State as merchandize,* and also to oblige the owners of slaves to treat them with humanity.’ †

Mr. BENTON exultingly alluded to the fact, that the application from Arkansas for admission had been put into the hands of a *Senator from a non-slaveholding State*, while that from Michigan came through a Senator from a slaveholding State. ‘*He considered this as an illustration of the decay of the spirit of abolitionism*’!—Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. MORRIS contended that Arkansas had a right to prohibit or *perpetuate* slavery at her pleasure!—Mr. EWING, of Ohio, thought the Bill less objectionable than that for the admission of Michigan!—It was opposed by the Senators from Vermont, (Messrs. SWIFT and PRENTISS,) but MESSRS. WEBSTER and DAVIS seemed to have studiously shunned the question. The only remonstrances that were sent to Congress, in opposition to this measure, emanated from the calumniated abolitionists and the Society of Friends. When it was proposed to admit Missouri as a slaveholding State, feelings of indignation and horror seemed to pervade the breasts of all classes of society throughout the non-slaveholding States. The pulpit gave its solemn protest—the press lifted up its voice of thunder—the public halls resounded with eloquent harangues in opposition—and memorials, deprecating the extension of slavery, poured into Congress from every quarter of the Union, except the South. ‘Agitation’ was

* ‘They shall have power’—but if ever that power shall be exercised, it will only be when Arkansas is glutted with slavery, and, like Virginia, needs rather to export than import human beings as merchandize. Any prohibitory law, moreover, might easily be evaded under that clause in the Constitution, which says that no power shall be given to hinder emigrants from bringing slaves into the States.

† ‘To treat them with humanity,’ by refusing to receive their testimony against white persons, and making them the property of a fellow-worm of the dust !

the order of the day. A large meeting of the citizens of Boston was holden in the State House, and several of the most distinguished citizens, with DANIEL WEBSTER at their head, were appointed a Committee to remonstrate against such a black addition to the Federal Republic. Even HARRISON GRAY OTIS, then Senator in Congress from Massachusetts, made long and eloquent speeches, in the name of bleeding humanity, in which he contended that slavery was morally wrong and a curse, and therefore that its extension by Congress ought not to be granted. Those members from New-England, who voted in favor of admitting Missouri, were visited with political retribution by their indignant constituents, and were compelled to retire to private life, covered with reproach and shame !—But how have the consciences of the people been seared since 1819—and how withering have been the influences of slavery by its extension in that particular instance ! Though the Constitution of Arkansas expressly provides for the perpetuity of slavery, as long as a single tyrant shall desire to sway the rod of oppression, yet its application for admission into the Union excited no general uneasiness—called forth no expressions of alarm—no public meetings were held, except by certain ‘madmen’ and ‘fanatics’—and DANIEL WEBSTER, filling the post that was occupied by H. G. OTIS in 1819, never once opened his lips by way of remonstrance, but suffered the horrid act to be done without lifting up his voice or recording his vote against it in the Senate of the United States ! Not one of the many of northern members who voted in favor of admission, has been forsaken or even rebuked by his constituents !—Even the memorials that were sent to the House of Representatives, praying for an amendment to the Constitution of Arkansas, to exclude slavery from its soil, were not only denied a reading, but their reception was objected to ! And the Speaker of the House decided—arbitrary and absurd as the decision may appear—that they came within the resolution, referring all papers on the subject of abolition *in the District of Columbia*, to the select committee on that subject !

The *manner* in which the question of admission was treated in the House of Representatives, adds deeply to the infamy of the act, and furnishes a precedent which ought to fill the entire North with alarm, as fraught with consequences most fatal to northern liberty. We have stated that the remonstrances, which were sent to the House, were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, without being read. Not satisfied with thus virtually denying the right of petition in this instance, as well as in relation to slavery in the national District, *a gag was put into the mouths of northern members*, not one of whom was suffered to open his lips in opposition to the Bill. In vain did the vigilant, clear-sighted, and venerable ADAMS attempt to gain a hearing: his voice was stifled by the clamors of an inflexible majority. Free discussion of the subject of slavery is not tolerated in either of the two houses of Congress!

The *time* at which the vote was taken upon the question of admission, is not less remarkable. It was at the heel of the session—at midnight—when, as MR. WISE of Virginia declared, the members were either ‘tired, sleepy, or drunk’! Many were brought from their beds by interested runners. Well might they choose midnight, in which to perpetrate such a deed of darkness!

The *guilt* of this transaction belongs emphatically to the FREE STATES. Their representatives might have prevented it by a majority of more than forty votes, but—with some honorable exceptions—they basely went with the South. If, therefore, up to this period, the nation, as such, had not been implicated in the sin of slavery, this vote, extending the dominion of the curse, covers the whole land with blood-guiltiness. Truly, ‘a wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land.’ ‘Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord? Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?’

If the limits of this Report would permit, we might dilate upon the atrocious wickedness evinced in admitting another slaveholding State into the Union. By this admission, the emancipation of two millions and a half of our countrymen from

their chains is rendered more hopeless. By it, the whole slave-system is invigorated, because it opens an immense territory, new and fertile, to the traffickers in human flesh, and of course greatly enhances the market value of 'slaves and souls of men.'* By it, a dangerous augmentation of political power has been put into the hands of a slaveholding aristocracy more imperious and rapacious than all the aristocracies of the old world *en masse*. By it, freedom of speech and of the press, the rights of conscience, personal protection, the privilege of locomotion, the unobstructed and impartial circulation of the Bible, true gospel fidelity in preaching, and the benefits of education for all classes, are absolutely impaired, if not effectually taken away. By it, cruelty of the extremest kind,—robbery of the meanest character,—pollution of the direst turpitude,—the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes by the abrogation of the marriage covenant,—the sale of mothers and infants, of husbands and wives, *of the lowly disciples of Jesus Christ*,—the demolition of mind, and the ruin of souls,—are made legal and honorable.

TEXAS.

For the last ten years, the slaveholders of the South have been looking to the acquisition of Texas to the Union, with a burning thirst of avarice which nothing but human blood can allay, and a cannibal appetite for human flesh which nothing but hecatombs of sable victims can satisfy. Whether it should be obtained by purchase, revolution, or conquest, has been a matter of indifference to them—to GET IT is all that they have wanted. The value of such a prize to the South, (aside from political considerations,) may be inferred from the following brief

* The Cincinnati Philanthropist, (edited by Mr. BIRNEY,) of Jan. 17th, 1836, contains the following startling paraphrase:

'REPUBLICANISM AND SLAVERY. A gentleman just from Arkansas says, that when he left that country, there were supposed to be in it at least TWO THOUSAND *native African* slaves!—A great proportion of these were sent into Arkansas by the Texas '*patriots*' who went from the United States, to secure them against the liberating spirit of Santa Anna when he threatened to overrun the country. The others were doubtless imported by citizens of Arkansas, or smuggled into Louisiana and thence into Arkansas, by those who have incorporated slavery into the Constitution of this new State.'

statement. The slave population of this country now amounts to 2,500,000, which Mr. CALHOUN, in his Report to the Senate, estimates to be worth 'equal at least to \$950,000,000'—averaging \$380 per head. This is undoubtedly a low estimate, as their market value is at present exorbitantly high, able-bodied men selling readily for \$1000 each. It is estimated that the acquisition of Texas would raise their price *fifty per cent.* at least—thus it would at once be a gain to the South of \$375,000,000!† The act of the government of Mexico in 1829, proclaiming liberty throughout all the land, and the refusal of that country to part with Texas as a matter of sale, frustrated the hopes of the slave-speculators, of a peaceful acquisition. Many of them, therefore, boldly emigrated to Texas, carrying their slaves with them, and evading the law of Mexico by indenting them as apprentices for the term of ninety-nine years! Their latent design was, to revolutionize that country as soon as a favorable opportunity should present itself. That opportunity—favorable beyond their most sanguine expectations—was found in the unnatural conduct of the North toward the abolitionists. It was indeed a master-stroke of policy on the part of the South, to inflame the mind of the North to mad-

* This immense sum shows to what extent the slaves of the South are robbed by their masters. An anecdote respecting Mr. O'Connell will serve to illustrate this matter:—At a great anti-slavery meeting in Exeter Hall, London, in 1833, a Mr. Liggins, a person connected with the West India interests, contended that emancipation would certainly ruin the planters, because it would be impossible for them to pay the slaves £160,000 a week for their labor, as that sum would be required for that purpose; whereas there were not more than £20,000 in all the colonies!—Mr. O'Connell instantly rose and said:—He (Mr. Liggins) had announced an awful fact, that the colonists could not pay wages to the slaves—that it would cost them £160,000 a week. *What was this but robbing the slaves of £160,000 a week?*—robbing them of labor worth that sum! But he had told them another fact, which he (Mr. O'Connell) was rejoiced to hear, as it showed that it was inconsistent with the providence of God, that villany should prosper: he had told them that this villany was of the most beggarly description—for though the villains got £160,000 a week for nothing, yet they had not £20,000 in money! He turned to the West Indian, and asked him how he dared to rob the slave of £160,000, when instead of benefit, it was only productive of beggary? How frightful this appeared on the face of it! This £160,000 a week, made £8,320,000 a year!—The effect of this reply was electrical. According to this calculation, (as there are three times as many slaves in this country as existed in the British colonies,) the southern planters are plundering their slaves of \$2,133,333 a week, or \$110,933,333 a year!—An lyet they demand compensation!

† Mr. Gholson, of the Virginia Assembly, stated in 1832, that the price of slaves fell *twenty-five per cent.* within two hours after the news of the non-importation act of Louisiana was known in that State.

ness against the principles and measures of a large portion of her philanthropic citizens, and to frighten her into subjection by threats of disunion, and thus to commit her on the side of southern interests, step by step, beyond the possibility of retreat ; so that she should be unable, or at least unwilling to interpose a barrier to the annexation of Texas to the American Union. Let it not be forgotten, that the invasion of Texas was made by the South at a time when the fires of persecution, kindled to consume all who should dare to doubt or deny the divine right of slavery, were blazing all over the nominally free States ! This invasion excited the liveliest sympathy throughout the country, and was generally applauded by the newspaper press. It was impudently compared to the revolutionary struggle of 1776, and eulogized in the U. S. Senate, by Mr. PRESTON, as ‘a struggle for rights and free institutions’ ! Volunteers from almost every section of the Union, but chiefly from the slaveholding States, poured into Texas, in order to reinstate slavery upon its soil. Of the character of the leaders in this black crusade, the Boston Atlas of April 16th, (a paper opposed to the abolitionists,) speaks in the following emphatic terms :

‘Who are the LEADERS in this ‘heroic struggle’ ? General Houston, once Governor of Tennessee, but since that, a chief of the Cherokees, a miserable vagabond and brawler, lately enacting Lynch’s law at Washington, now the apostle of Texian freedom. Robert Potter, once a member of Congress, but infamous throughout the Union for his bloody brutality and universal scoundrelism—lately the tenant of the state prison ; expelled with scorn and contempt from the legislature of North Carolina ; now ‘a great character’ in Texas. Add to these, all the murderers, swindlers, and horse-thieves, who have fled from the Southern States for the last ten years, and the list of Texian heroes will be complete. These people may be, in the opinion of North Americans, fit to instruct the poor benighted Mexicans in the science of liberty and good government ; but the only discoveries they have yet offered to introduce among them, are SLAVERY and LYNCH’S LAW—two grand republican panaceas, of which, if Mexicans cannot yet apprehend the *sublime* merits, the extreme darkness of their ignorance must be their excuse.’

The following paragraph, from the Mobile Advertiser, contains a frank avowal of the object of the South in attempting the conquest of the Texas territory :

‘The South wish to have Texas admitted into the Union for two reasons : First, to equalize the South with the North, and secondly, as a convenient and safe place calculated from its peculiarly good soil and salubrious climate for a slave population.—

Interest and political safety both, alike prompt the action and enforce the argument. . . *They have an awful foe in all those who demand the emancipation of their slaves, and who call upon them to give up their property now and forever.*'

The New-York Sunday News gives the following additional evidence :

'The determination so generally expressed in favor of the incorporation of Texas into the Union, is based upon the fact that the measure is necessary, *in order to strengthen the South against the machinations of the Northern abolitionists. If the Union continues, the South must be aided by the addition of four or five new States carved out of Texas*, and one new State formed by the territory of Florida. There are now twelve slaveholding States out of twenty-six in the Union; and the addition of five more will give them a majority of *six* members in the Senate of the United States, and enable them to hold in check the radicalism of Northern representation in the House of Representatives.'

The manner in which the faith of our treaties with Mexico has been kept, may be seen by the following paragraph from the Vicksburg (Miss.) Register :

'**THREE THOUSAND MEN FOR TEXAS.**—Gen. Dunlap, of Tennessee, is about to proceed to Mexico with the above number of men. The whole corps are now at Memphis. They will not, it is said, pass this way. Every man is completely armed, the corps having been *originally raised for the Florida war*. This force, we have no doubt, will be able to carry every thing before it.'

And the following, from the Louisville (Ky.) Journal:

'A field battery of six guns—four six pounders and two twenty-four pound howitzers—with all the implements for service, and one thousand balls, shells, and cannisters, presented to the Republic of Texas by Maj. Gen. T. J. Chambers, arrived in this city under the charge of Major McLeod, on the 27th inst. They are splendid pieces of artillery. They will be in Texas in three or four weeks, and the way their wide mouths will talk to the Mexicans, will be a caution to all the foes of liberty.' (! !)

The Pensacola Gazette states, that 'General Gaines sent an officer of the United States army into Texas to reclaim some deserters. He found them already enlisted in the Texian service, to the number of two hundred. *They still wore the uniform of our army*, but refused to return.' Gen. Gaines himself crossed the boundary line with his army, and marched seventy miles into the Mexican territory, to the military post of Nacogdoches—ostensibly, it is true, to prevent or punish Indian depredations, but evidently in order to countenance the Texian rebels.

This is our *neutrality*, as a nation, in the face of the following solemn contract with the Mexican republic :

‘There shall be a firm, inviolable, and universal peace, and a true and sincere friendship between the United States of America, and the United Mexican States, in all the extent of their possessions and territories, between their people and citizens respectively, without distinctions of persons or places.’

The forbearance of the Mexican government, in view of this atrocious violation of the faith of treaties, is remarkable. Let us reverse the case. Let us suppose that some Mexican adventurers had settled in some part of Louisiana ; that to them had been granted by our government, unusual privileges and exemptions ;* that, on some false and frivolous pretences, they had raised the standard of rebellion, and called upon their Mexican brethren to come over to their aid ; that they had sent some of their number to Mexico to enlist troops and obtain supplies ; that the presses of that country had generally justified their rebellion ; that Mexican soldiers, even without changing their uniform, had flocked to their standard from all quarters of the country ; that Mexican Senators and Representatives, in Congress assembled, had precipitately urged upon that body a recognition of the independence of the State of Louisiana ; that the Mexican government had winked at all these movements, or, after a long delay, had at last issued an equivocal message, recommending the observance of strict neutrality between the contending parties ; and, finally, that the independence of the rebels and invaders had been acknowledged by the Mexican Congress ;—would not this country have been roused to madness, and have declared war with Mexico, as a nation basely recreant to her faith ?—ay, even before one-half of these events had transpired ? And yet the Mexican insurrectionists might have pleaded, that their object was to secure universal emancipation in Louisiana, without regard to complexional caste ; but the Texians avow that they are stimulated by a determination to re-establish slavery and the slave-trade upon the soil which has

* ‘The reception of the Texas settlers by the Mexican government has been hospitable and liberal beyond example. Land has been given to them, they have been exempted from taxes and duties during ten years, on the one hand, and protected by a high tariff against foreign competition in the markets for their produce, on the other; they have the unprecedented indulgence of legal proceedings in their *own language*, a matter into which national punctilio might be expected to enter; and they have enjoyed as perfect civil and religious liberty, as it seems possible for human institutions to secure.’—*Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine*.

been purged from these abominations. They abhor the idea of emancipation, and are eager to administer Lynch law to every abolitionist.* By the Constitution which they have adopted, none but 'free WHITE persons' can become citizens of this Republic. The 9th Section is in the following words :

'SEC. 9. All persons of color, who were slaves for life previous to their emigration to Texas, and who *are now held in bondage*, shall remain in the like state of servitude, provided the said slave shall be the bona fide property of the person so holding said slave as aforesaid. *Congress shall pass no laws to prohibit emigrants from the United States of America from bringing their slaves into the Republic with them*, and holding them by the same tenure by which such slaves were held in the United States; *nor shall Congress have the power to emancipate slaves; nor shall any slaveholder be allowed to emancipate his or her slave or slaves, without the consent of Congress*, unless he or she shall send his or her slave or slaves without the limits of the Republic. No free person of African descent, either in whole or in part, shall be permitted to reside permanently in the Republic, without the consent of Congress; and the importation or admission of Africans or negroes into this Republic, EXCEPTING FROM THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, is forever prohibited, and declared to be piracy.'

It seems, then, that in this *free, republican* territory, slavery is not only made constitutional, but Congress has no power to prohibit the foreign slave-trade between Texas and the United States†—nor to emancipate slaves on the soil; nor are slaveholders themselves allowed to abandon their oppression, except by expelling their victims beyond the limits of the Republic! It is in vain that we search the annals of slavery, to find a parallel to a section like this! The clause which prohibits the importation of slaves from Africa, and other places, can be easily evaded, as the following article from the Boston Atlas of April 19th demonstrates :

'Slaves are constantly arriving at the Havana; and we state upon the best authority, that "a gentleman of Texas," the brother of one high in office under the Federal government, is, or not long ago was, in the United States, for the purpose of procuring *American* vessels to proceed to Havana, and there to take in cargoes of slaves for the Texian market. When it was suggested to this gentleman, that this would be

* Benjamin Lundy, the veteran advocate of emancipation, states that he was near being robbed *twice* in his late tour in Texas—that the 'tar and feathers' were prepared, and would have been applied, had not a *Mexican* officer been near, and informed of the proceeding.

† 'The land of the free, and the asylum of the oppressed,' allowed, by way of special favor, to be the GUINEA of Texian marauders and rapacious men-stealers! This is done to secure the co-operation of the South.

engaging in the slave-trade, and that by our laws the slave-trade was piracy, the Texian stopped the objector's mouth by referring to a late decision by a learned judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, that to take slaves as *passengers* from one point of the African coast to another, is *not* engaging in the slave-trade; and he argued—and the argument seems difficult to refute—that to take slaves as *passengers*, (and this was all he wanted of the ship-owners,) from Havana to Texas, would fall under the same rule. This same gentleman assured our informant, that the two or three thousand AFRICAN SLAVES now in Texas, seemed to be very happy and contented—they only complained a little, at being separated from their wives and children !'

On the 22d of December last, a message was transmitted by President JACKSON to the House of Representatives, in relation to Texas, in which was the following seemingly honest recommendation :

'The title of Texas to the territory she claims, is identified with her independence. She asks us to acknowledge that title to the territory, *with an avowed design to treat immediately of its transfer to the United States*. It becomes us to beware of a too early movement, as it might subject us, however unjustly, to the imputation of seeking to establish the claim of our neighbors to a territory, with a view to its subsequent acquisition by ourselves. Prudence, therefore, seems to dictate that we should still stand aloof, and maintain our present attitude, if not until Mexico itself, or one of the great foreign powers, shall recognize the independence of the new Government, at least until the lapse of time or the course of events shall have proved beyond cavil or dispute, the ability of the people of that country to maintain their separate sovereignty, and to uphold the Government constituted by them.'

Whether this was intended as a mere *ruse*, in order to prevent any excitement at the North, at the prospect of a sudden recognition of Texian independence—or whether it was uttered in sincerity—certain it is, that that recognition has been made by the U. S. Senate, by a vote of 23 to 19,* and the Texian minister has been acknowledged by our Government ! This conduct cannot fail to excite the astonishment of the civilized world, and deepen the infamy which rests upon the character of our country. Nothing can extenuate it, for it is marked by criminal precipitancy and the basest treachery. †

* Some delay has taken place in the printing of this Report, and hence we anticipate the record of another year, in this particular.

† The independence of Hayti has been maintained more than thirty years, and recognized by France—yet no such recognition has been made by our Government !—According to Benjamin Lundy, the population of Texas, in 1833, amounted to only 21,000 : supposing it to have been doubled since that period by the American invaders, it is now only half as large as that of the city of Boston ! What a republic !

One other step remains to be taken by this country, to reach the climax of her iniquity : it is, to annex the REPUBLIC (?) of Texas to the American Union ! To what scenes of misery and horror may not this recognition and annexation give rise ! In the opinion of that far-sighted and sagacious statesman, JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, it is more than probable that we shall be involved in ‘a Mexican war ; a war with Great Britain, if not with France ; a general Indian war ; a servile war ; and, as an inevitable consequence of them all, a civil war.’ In his celebrated speech in Congress, on the Texian and Indian Wars and Slavery, in May last, he uses the following prophetic language :

‘ If, by the utter imbecility of the Mexican confederacy, this revolt of Texas should lead immediately to its separation from that Republic, and its annexation to the United States, I believe it impossible that Great Britain should look on, while this operation is performing, with indifference. She will see that it must shake her own colonial power on this continent, in the Gulf of Mexico, and in the Carribean seas, like an earthquake ; she will see, too, that it endangers her own abolition of slavery in her own colonies. A war for the restoration of slavery where it has been abolished, if successful in Texas, must extend over all Mexico ; and the example will threaten her with imminent danger of a war of colors in her own islands. She will take possession of Cu’a and of Porto Rico, by cession from Spain, or by the batteries from her wooden walls ; and if you ask her by what authority she has done it, she will ask you in return, by what authority you have extended your sea coast from the Sabine to the Rio Bravo. She will ask you a question more perplexing, namely—by what authority you, with freedom, independence, and democracy upon your lips, are waging a war of extermination to forge new manacles and fetters, instead of those which are falling from the hands and feet of man. She will carry emancipation and abolition with her in every fold of her flag ; while your stars, as they increase in numbers, will be overcast with the murky vapors of oppression, and the only portion of your banners visible to the eye, will be the blood-stained stripes of the taskmaster.’

* * * * *

‘ Urged on by the irresistible, overwhelming torrent of public opinion, Great Britain has recently, at a cost of one hundred millions of dollars, which her People have joyfully paid, abolished slavery throughout all her colonies in the West Indies. After setting such an example, she will not—it is impossible that she should—stand by and witness a war for the re-establishment of slavery where it had been for years abolished, and situated thus in the immediate neighborhood of her islands. She will tell you, that if you must have Texas as a member of your Confederacy, it must be without the trammels of slavery, and if you will wage a war to handcuff and fetter your fellow-man, she will wage a war against you to break his chains. Sir, what a figure, in the eyes of mankind, would you make, in deadly conflict with Great Britain : she fighting the battles of emancipation, and you the battles of slavery ; she the benefactress, and you the oppressor, of human kind ! In such a war, the enthusiasm of emancipation, too, would unite vast numbers of her People in aid of the national rivalry, and all her natural jealousy against our aggrandizement. No war was ever so popular

in England as that war would be against slavery, the slave-trade, and the Anglo-Saxon descendant from her own loins.*

But, be the consequences to this country what they may, the admission of Texas into the Union, at the next session of Congress, is regarded by the southern States as a certain event ! They have not invaded that country, and made havoc of human life, and poured out their blood and treasure, merely to have the satisfaction of witnessing its independence. They claim it as their own, and they mean to possess it.* They have many powerful motives in seeking its acquisition :—It can be divided into NINE STATES, each as large as Kentucky :—It will give the South omnipotent political power over the North, in Congress :—It will open a new world for the prosecution of the domestic slave-trade :—It will save the South from a speedy bankruptcy :—It will furnish a precedent for *making new conquests of Mexican territory*. For if Texas may be forcibly separated from Mexico, and annexed to the American Union, why may not Coahuila, Tamaulipas, and Santa Fe ? And most assuredly they will be, unless the people of the Northern States lift up their voices UNITEDLY and INSTANTLY, in inflexible opposition to the admission of Texas ! If they yield in this instance, **THEY ARE LOST**—the Union will inevitably be dashed in pieces—and the sun of American freedom will set in an ocean of blood. It is impossible that LIBERTY and SLAVERY can reign together—one or the other must perish : they are mortal enemies, who are now engaged in a death-struggle for victory. Wo to the non-slaveholding States, if they consent to remain under the dominion of SLAVERY ! if they conspire to take the life of LIBERTY ! Let the prospect of the annexation of Texas agitate, alarm, inflame, UNITE their entire population ; let the measure be resisted with invincible energy ; let their Senators and Representatives in Congress witness such an expression of public sentiment, that not one of

* At a public dinner given to Messrs. Calhoun and Preston in Charleston, S. C., ' Mr. Calhoun,' says the Mercury, ' spoke of Texas—and at that name was interrupted with long and loud cheering : and his concluding words on that topic, pronounced with deep emotion,(!) that "TEXAS MUST BE ANNEXED TO THE UNION," were answered with a universal burst of applause.'

them shall dare to 'go with the South'; let the pulpit and the press be faithful to their high trust; let public meetings be held in every city, town and village; and let all political and sectarian feuds be banished, that there may be a perfect union of feeling and action on this momentous question. Why should there not be this union? The question is not, whether abolitionists are right or wrong; nor whether slavery should be immediately or gradually abolished; nor whether Congress has, or has not, the power to emancipate the slaves in the District of Columbia: but it is, whether such a weight of political power shall be thrown into the scale of southern slavery, as to make northern liberty kick the beam; whether a foreign territory shall be added to our republic, for the express purpose of extending the empire of slavery, and invigorating both the foreign and domestic slave-trade; whether a FREE LABOR OR SLAVE-DRIVING policy shall govern the nation; whether, in fine, we shall run the hazard of the bloody wars enumerated by Mr. ADAMS, or, for self-preservation, unyieldingly refuse our assent to the admission of Texas into the Union. All other questions, at the present crisis, sink into insignificance in comparison. No labor, no expense, can be too great in bringing Congress to a right decision.

GEORGE THOMPSON — BRITISH PHILANTHROPISTS AND
CHRISTIANS.

At the time of issuing the last Annual Report of this Society, the intelligence of GEORGE THOMPSON'S arrival in England had not reached this country. Ten thousand hearts, bound to him by the ties of christian love, were filled with the deepest anxiety for the safety of himself and family; for it was in the inclement month of December, that they were compelled to embark for their native shores. Mr. THOMPSON landed at Liverpool, January 4th, 1836, after a rough and perilous passage of 38 days from St. John, New-Brunswick. At the beautiful abode of JAMES CROPPER,—renowned as a merchant, and not less as one of the noblest philanthropists of ancient or modern

times,—he was most cordially entertained. As soon as his presence in Liverpool was known, the Musical Fund Hall, a spacious and beautiful building, was generously offered to him gratis, for the delivery of as many addresses as he might choose to give, illustrative of his mission to this country. This was the first reception given to ‘the foreign emissary,’ ‘the scoundrel,’ ‘the fugitive from justice,’ as he was opprobriously called, during his sojourn among us. Next, a splendid Soiree was given to him in the Monteith Rooms, Glasgow, January 25th, 1836. ‘At 7 o’clock,’ says the Glasgow Chronicle, ‘the large and splendid hall was crowded with a brilliant assembly, awaiting in anxious expectation the illustrious individual whom they were met to honor. . . . *His reception was beyond description*, and forcibly exhibited how highly the assembly appreciated the valuable services he had rendered to the glorious cause of emancipation.’ The Rev. WILLIAM ANDERSON offered the following resolution, which was adopted by acclamation :

‘Resolved, That this meeting, with unmingled delight, welcomes the return of Mr. THOMPSON from America—seizes this early opportunity to express its high admiration of the blameless propriety, distinguished talent, and noble self-devotion, with which he has prosecuted the great object of his mission to the United States, in the face of national prejudice, interested denunciations, and lawless violence—and feels devoutly grateful to that God, who, amidst such opposition, has crowned his labors with signal success, and through many perils, brought him again safely to these shores.’

In support of the above resolution, Mr. A. spoke of Mr. THOMPSON in the following terms :

‘When our excellent guest first appeared among us, it was with a warm heart; he came to hearts as warm—warm with sympathy for the afflicted Negro, and warm with zeal for the breaking of his bonds. In these circumstances, one meeting was enough to unite us, one stroke was enough to weld the glowing materials into an indissoluble brotherhood. His personal, individual qualifications have, undoubtedly, had great influence in the matter. I refer not to his intellectual qualifications. Such gifts, unless connected with moral qualities, make no conquest of the heart. What, then, is the case of our friend in this respect? He came among us with powers of discussion, powers of debate, powers of analyzing evidence, powers of classifying evidence, powers of exposing it, powers of confirming it, powers of reasoning, powers of declamation, powers of humor to make us laugh, powers of pathos to make us weep, powers of fire to stir us up to vengeance, powers as varied as those of the lyre of Timotheus, and of greater strength—(enthusiastic cheers)—such powers, that we all at once gave way, and put him in the first place, that of the elder brother of our Emancipation family—the Captain of our great moral enterprise. (Renewed cheering.) And how did

he bear himself under these honors ? Did his morality break down ? Did any of us ever see any symptom of self-conceit in him, or of nurtured vanity ? Did any of us ever feel he had cause for complaining of his presuming over him ? Never. We have indeed seen his eye, that which his Maker gave him to be used for holy purposes, gathering fire and sparkling with the consciousness of the power of the thunderbolt which he was forging within his bosom for the destruction of his adversary ; but when he had launched it, and scathed him, and prostrated him, could we gather from any expression either of word or look, that he took personal consequence to himself for what he had done ? (Cheers.) * * * * Our attention was turned to America, and dearly as we loved Mr. Thompson, and perilous although the adventure was, we grudged him not to the oppressed of that land. It appeared perilous from the beginning. In these perilous circumstances, we sent forth our friend ; and now that he is with us again in health and life, let us bless God for his preservation. What has he accomplished ? We expect much. We had had experience of his talents, his zeal, his fortitude, and of his prudence too. For, notwithstanding the ardor of his mind, and the provoking circumstances in which he managed our own cause, who ever heard an ungentlemanly expression drop from his lips ? High as our confidence was in him, he has labored to an extent far beyond our calculation ; and far beyond our calculation has been his success. He has kindled a flame in America, it is said, which will not be extinguished. This is not the correct representation. He has gone with the torch of liberty throughout its forests, kindling it at a thousand points, and soon it will be a universal conflagration.'

The Rev. D. KING said—' One galling circumstance with regard to slavery in the United States, was, it being so frequently held up BY THE TORIES as an argument against liberal constitutions ; *and this could never be satisfactorily answered, until immediate, complete, and unconditional emancipation be obtained for the slave.*'

On the evening of Jan. 29th, Mr. THOMPSON delivered an address in the Rev. Dr. WARDLAW's chapel, the Rev. Dr. HUGH occupying the Chair. In introducing Mr. T. to the meeting, he said—

' Ladies and gentlemen, you are assembled this evening to see again—and that is no small privilege—our well-known friend before you, (cheers) of whom, in his presence, I cannot trust myself to speak as I would were he absent, but whose eulogium it is unnecessary for me to attempt to pronounce in a meeting of my fellow-citizens of Glasgow assembled in this place, the well remembered scene of his former eloquent pleadings, protracted conflicts, and decisive and splendid triumphs. Mr. T. returns to us from the American shores, with his name and his well-earned fame untarnished. He has neither been defeated nor dishonored. He has retreated, not fled, from America. He has retreated, by the urgency of friends, from lawless physical violence ; but he has never fled, and, if I mistake him not, he never will flee from any field of fair intellectual conflict. (Cheers.) He never went thither for the purpose of physical warfare, to fight the pro-slavery men with the fist, or the poignard, or the firelock ; he went to proclaim in the ears of America, the voice of truth and humanity ; and

thousands and tens of thousands of the best and most enlightened citizens of that country bear him witness that he has nobly fulfilled his mission; for I am confident, that documentary evidence, of the most unquestionable character, will support me, when I say, that when brute violence was not interposed against his person, and in every instance in which the conflict was mental alone, his success has not been less signal in America, than at any period of his career in Great Britain. (Cheers.)

Mr. THOMPSON next went to Edinburgh, and lectured before the Emancipation Society of that city, in the Rev. Dr. PEDDIE's chapel, to an audience of more than two thousand persons—the admission to the meeting being by tickets, sixpence each. On his appearance, he was ‘received with several distinct rounds of enthusiastic applause,’ and was repeatedly cheered throughout his lecture. His reception by the ladies and gentlemen forming the Committees of the Society alluded to, was ‘very flattering. Resolutions highly complimentary to himself were unanimously adopted. An eloquent and strongly encomiastic Address was also presented to him, at an Entertainment given to him by the Inhabitants of Edinburgh, in the Assembly Rooms, George-street, on the evening of the 19th February, 1836. It commenced as follows:—‘Esteemed and Honored Friend: This meeting have come together for the purpose of testifying the regard in which you are held by the friends of liberty and humanity in this city.’ It was signed, in behalf of the meeting, by ROBERT KAYE GREVILLE, L. L. D. Chairman. Mr. THOMPSON gave a second public lecture in Edinburgh, in Rev. Dr. BROWNE's chapel, and ‘was rapturously applauded as usual.’ At the close of it, JOHN WIGHAM, Jr. Esq. was called to the chair, and a series of resolutions were moved by Rev. Dr. RITCHIE, and unanimously adopted by the meeting—among which was the following:

‘Resolved, After what has been now and formerly stated by Mr. GEORGE THOMPSON, we are fully persuaded that he has in spirit, procedure, and success, exceeded the most sanguine expectations of the Emancipation Society—that by his firmness and prudence, zeal and perseverance in advocating the cause of the bondmen in the United States, he has amply redeemed every pledge given by him to the friends of human freedom, by whom he was deputed—that, amidst obloquy, peril, and physical violence, he continued to persevere, until, by the verdict of transatlantic friends, the best judges in this matter, his remaining longer would, without promoting the cause, have compromised his own safety. We acknowledge the good hand of Providence that has been around him, bid him cordial welcome to his native shore, renew our expressions

of confidence in him as a talented advocate of the liberties of man, and trust that a suitable field may soon be opened for the renewal of his exertions.'

At a subsequent meeting, at which the Lord Provost of Edinburgh presided, Mr. THOMPSON 'was received with tremendous applause,' and the thanks of the meeting given to him, 'for his intrepid, able and successful services in the cause of Universal Emancipation, and particularly for his arduous and persevering exertions during his recent mission to the United States of America.'

At the Second Annual Meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, held on the evening of 1st March,—Rev. Dr. WARDLAW in the chair,—it was unanimously

'Resolved, That this Society, in compliance with the invitation of many philanthropists in America, and in connection with other Societies in this country, having deputed Mr. GEORGE THOMPSON as their Agent to the United States, to co-operate with the friends of the abolition of Slavery there, in their efforts to awaken their countrymen to a sense of their duty towards more than two millions of their brethren held by them in cruel bondage, express their cordial approval, and high admiration of the power, intrepidity, and devotion, with which, in the face of formidable opposition, unsparing abuse, and great personal hazards, Mr. THOMPSON was enabled, by the grace of God, to pursue, and in a good measure to accomplish the great object of his very arduous mission.'

In London, Mr. THOMPSON gave several public lectures, in all of which he was received with loud applause. At a meeting held in Finsbury Chapel,—WILLIAM KNIGHT, Esq. in the Chair,—the following resolution was offered by EDWIN BALDWIN, Esq. :

'Resolved, That having heard Mr. Thompson's justification of the course he pursued in America, this meeting is decidedly of opinion, that, in the perilous position in which he was placed, and under the circumstances of great difficulty and trial, he fulfilled his duty as a man and a Christian, and is deserving the commendation of every friend of humanity.'

Judge JEREMIE, in seconding the resolution, bore his testimony to the able exertions of Mr. THOMPSON in promoting the cause in which he was engaged, and to the courageous manner in which he had advocated those principles which he had ever maintained. The resolution was then put, and carried by acclamation.

On Thursday, the 18th August, a meeting was held in Exeter Hall, London,—RICHARD PECK, Esq. late High Sheriff of

the city of London and the county of Middlesex, in the chair, at which, after an eloquent address from Mr. THOMPSON, the following resolution was carried by acclamation, the meeting standing up :

‘Resolved, That this meeting hail with delight, the safe return of their distinguished countryman to his native land, and respectfully offer him their warm and grateful acknowledgments for his philanthropic and self-denying labors in the United States of America, in behalf of their suffering and oppressed fellow-men.’

Having thus shown how exceedingly honorable has been the reception of our beloved coadjutor in the great cities of England and Scotland,—to the utter confusion of his base traducers in this country,—we must sum up all his labors and rewards, since his return, by saying, that in all parts of the British kingdom, wherever he has travelled, he has obtained the sympathy, applause and co-operation of the wise and good, without distinction of sect or party, in a manner and to an extent wholly unprecedented in the annals of philanthropy. Through his instrumentality, the most tender appeals, the most affecting expostulations, and the most faithful rebukes, have been addressed by almost every religious denomination in that country to its own in the United States, in relation to the awful guilt of American slavery, and the imperative duty of endeavoring to effect its immediate overthrow. If these have not been received, by the religious bodies for whom they were intended, in good temper and with christian comity in every instance,—they have nevertheless made a powerful impression upon the religious community at large, and gladdened the hearts, and strengthened the hands of all the true disciples of ‘Jesus Christ, and him crucified,’ in this nominally christian land. If they had emanated from political instead of religious bodies of men,—from those who cherish hostility to liberty and free institutions, instead of those who profess to belong to a kingdom which is not of this world, and in which there are no national preferences nor foreign interests,—they would have excited no uneasiness of conscience, created no blush of shame, awakened no feeling of remorse, extorted no tear of contrition : but, bearing upon their form the impress of the spirit of Christ, and manifesting in their

language the intensity of holy solicitude,—and proceeding from the great body of CHRISTIAN BELIEVERS in England and Scotland, with an unanimity of sentiment which overleaps all sectarian divisions,—they startle the dull ear of the American Church like the noise of many waters, and cause American oppressors to quake as though the seventh angel had poured out his vial into the air. Yes—we assure our trans-atlantic brethren, who are so zealously laboring to effect the speedy abolition of slavery throughout the world, that they are aiding us most essentially in the great work of emancipation among ourselves, by their prayers, their testimonies, and their tears. Let them be stimulated anew to greater exertion by the reflection, that, though they are far removed from the immediate scene of action, and cannot directly participate in its perils and triumphs, their distant co-operation is none the less important—nay, it is indispensable : it is, moreover, fast bringing the strife to a speedy and glorious termination.

As specimens of the manner in which this vaunted land of liberty is frequently alluded to in England, in consequence of her oppression, let the following suffice. At a crowded anti-slavery meeting held in Birmingham last year, the Rev. Mr. MARSH rejoiced that ‘ he stood not now in America, where the professors of liberty would not allow him to open his mouth.’ The Rev. T. SWAN forcibly exclaimed—

‘ Blessed be God, in their highly favored country, the friends of the Negro were to be found. Britons were anxious that slaves might cease to breathe in any part of the world; *they were unacquainted with an aristocracy consisting merely in the color of the skin, and they despised that canting and dastardly republic on the other side of the Atlantic*, which boasted its love of liberty, and respect for the rights of man, whilst at the same time it held in the most degrading bondage, and shut out from celestial knowledge, from two to three millions of its subjects.’ ‘ The Christians of Birmingham would not be silent—they would speak out—they would cry aloud, and their voice would be heard in the Senate; it would enter the ears, and he trusted would move the heart of their King; it would go out to the ends of the earth; it would be heard in the islands of the West; it would cause the slaves to rejoice, the missionaries to triumph, and the tyrants to tremble—(cheers)—it would be heard in slave cursed America, and the PAINTED HYPOCRITES would quail, and be convinced that they required a REVIVAL indeed. (Cheers.) ’

Says the Birmingham Reformer—

‘A view of the national sin of America, after admiring the natural grandeur of their country, is like discovering the object of worship in the old temples of Egypt; where, after the stranger had walked bewildered through vistas of superb architecture, he came at last to the filthy idol,—a moulting and obscene Ape, playing its pranks on a throne of gold! And this is the thing to be worshipped in America—a mockery and disgrace of the human character ‘enthroned in the West’—a nation of slave-drivers masquerading it with the cap of liberty—a Christian people excelling all the heathen tribes in the world in systematic wickedness—a free republic exercising greater oppression than was ever heard of in the old king-scourged and priest-ridden despotisms of Europe! * * It is in vain to seek for words to express all we feel in view of these things—it must be the subject of mute astonishment and speechless horror. *The Almighty does not supply man with language to denounce these atrocities;* they excite ideas of abhorrence beyond our capacity of expression. These are infinite crimes, to be judged, condemned and punished by an infinite Being.’

Terrible as are these rebukes, they are all merited. From whom do they come? From the Tories of England? from the enemies of America? No! All who hate our country throughout the world, and who long to see it made a desolation, *rejoice in the existence of slavery in her midst, as a sufficient cause for her final overthrow*: while those who admire the theory of our government, who cherish a strong regard for our republican institutions, and who are struggling to subvert the despotisms of the old world, unite in calling upon us to let our oppressed fellow-countrymen go free, as the first step toward effecting the emancipation of a groaning world.

As evidence of the perfect unison which exists between the christian philanthropists of Great Britain and the abolitionists of the United States, we subjoin the following resolutions—pre-mising that we might have occupied our entire Report with quotations, most cordially approving our principles and measures, and deeply sympathizing with us in the trials which we are called to endure. Such testimony is invaluable.

At a public meeting in Glasgow, Jan. 25, 1836, it was

‘Resolved, That whilst this meeting deeply laments the conduct of many Christians in the United States, who, active in other fields of Christian duty, remain neutral in this momentous conflict, or lend their influences to the enemy, it has also great cause of thankfulness to God, that many able, enlightened, and pious philanthropists in all parts of the United States, have organized themselves with heroic firmness in the cause of immediate and universal negro emancipation—that this meeting affectionately proffers its friendship and co-operation to these kindred Societies—desires to strengthen their hands and to cheer their hearts, and pledges itself to aid them by its active exertions, its sympathies, and its prayers.’

At a meeting of the Edinburgh Emancipation Society, in the Saloon of the Royal Hotel, Jan. 31, it was

‘Resolved, That with feelings of strong sympathy, respect, and increased affection towards all those American citizens, both male and female, who, far from shrinking, have remained firm and undaunted,—we feel called upon to remember them before the God of righteousness and peace, with whom all the swellings of human passion are as nothing, that He may continue to preserve them, and enable us to persevere in the great cause of universal emancipation, to which we now stand, more than ever, bound to adhere.’

The following resolution was also adopted in the same city, at a public meeting, Feb. 1 :

‘Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with our anti-slavery friends in the United States, under the persecutions to which they have been subjected. We would remind them, that their persecutors are the libellers of the American Constitution, which proclaims the equal rights of all men, while they withhold from 2,000,000 of their fellow-citizens every natural right, and persecute the preachers of the doctrines of the Constitution. That they are the libellers of their Maker, since they found their injustice on that color of the skin which God has given to the negro. That in this, if in *any* cause, our friends may boldly say, greater is ‘He that is with us, than all that can be against us.’ We congratulate them on the rapid advance of their cause, exhort them to press onwards, and bid them God speed.’

At the second annual meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, March 1, it was

‘Resolved, That this Society express the delight with which they have contemplated the zeal, self-denial, energy, and liberality which so many individuals and Societies, male and female, in America, have displayed in favor of the abolition of slavery—cordially congratulate these American brethren on the auspicious prospects of success which a gracious Providence is now opening, tending to cheer and revive their exertions—and pledge themselves to employ the best means in their power to encourage these devoted friends in their great and hopeful struggle in this cause of enlightened humanity.’

At a public meeting held in Exeter Hall, London, Aug. 18, it was

‘Resolved, That this meeting have learnt with great satisfaction, of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and tender to its President, Officers and Members, the expression of their fraternal regards and christian sympathies :—That they contemplate with delight the rapid multiplication of effective auxiliaries, already amounting to six hundred, based upon the doctrine of the essential sinfulness of slavery, and the consequent duty of immediate and unconditional emancipation :—And while they would encourage the Abolitionists of the United States to steadfast continuance and increased exertion in their great work, they would offer them their cordial and zealous co-operation.’

The appalling defection of the English Baptist delegates, Messrs. Cox and Hovey, from the anti-slavery cause during their

calamitous visit to this country in 1835,—and the bold and fearless rebuke which they received from the lips of Mr. THOMPSON at the anniversary meeting in New-York,—are yet fresh in the memory of the American people. Those recreant delegates, by their time-serving policy, their refusal to countenance the labors of Mr. THOMPSON, their implied censure of his mission,* their exclusive association with the colonization and pro-slavery parties in the land, their inflexible determination not to take part in any anti-slavery meeting, their criminal silence on the subject of slavery in the Baptist Convention at Richmond, Virginia,—gave a severe blow to the cause of the down-trodden slave, and consequently gladdened the hearts of the slaveholders universally. It was confidently predicted by those who rejoiced in their guilty defection, that they would be sustained in their course by the Baptist churches in England, and that Mr. THOMPSON would be visited with severe censure for his condemnatory language at New York. Since the return of these delegates, they have published a narrative of their visit to this country, in which they endeavor to gloss over their unworthy conduct, but in vain. For, though they reached the English shore several months in advance of Mr. THOMPSON, and were therefore enabled to tell their own story without contradiction during his absence, yet they failed to satisfy their own denomination, and have since been buried beneath an avalanche of British indignation. Neither of them dared to confront Mr. THOMPSON before a British audience, with regard to the propriety of their course in America.

* The following is the note of Dr. Cox, declining attendance at the anniversary meeting in New-York :

MAY 12, 1835.

Gentlemen—If I decline the honor of appearing on your platform this day, on occasion of your anniversary meeting, I must be understood to assume a position of NEUTRALITY, not with regard to those great principles and objects which it is well known Britain in general, and our denomination in particular, have maintained and promoted, but with regard solely, to the political bearings of the question, with which, as a stranger, a foreigner, a visiter, I could not attempt to intermeddle.

I am, gentlemen, yours respectfully, F. A. COX.

This note was hailed by the enemies of emancipation as expressly condemnatory of Mr. Thompson's agency. Nobody asked or expected him or his colleague to 'meddle with the *political* bearings of the question,' but simply to lift up their voices against slavery on moral and religious grounds.

A public discussion on American slavery was held in the Rev. Dr. WARDLAW's Chapel, Glasgow, on the evenings of the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th of June, 1836, between Mr. THOMPSON and ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, 'Delegate from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, to the Congregational Union of England and Wales.' Mr. T. was the challenger. Dr. WARDLAW occupied the chair. In introducing the disputants to the audience, he spoke of Mr. THOMPSON in the following strain:—'He requires no introduction. He is no stranger. You know him. You know his person; you know his character; you know his sentiments; you know his eloquence; you know his zeal; you know his devotedness to his cause. These you have witnessed—these you have approved.' Even the haughty and scornful Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, who was so ready in this country to believe that Mr. T. was 'a felon,' was compelled to say to the audience, in his exordium—'Their affections and feelings had long been engaged to his opponent in this cause.' As a full and accurate Report of this important Discussion, corrected by the speakers themselves, has been very widely circulated, it is unnecessary to enlarge upon it, in this connexion. If any man could have successfully defended the American church and the American people, from the charge of upholding that horrid system which is laying waste so large a portion of God's heritage, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE would have been spared the shame and disgrace of an overwhelming defeat;—for his talents are of the highest order, and as a debater he is fluent, expert, eloquent. No candid mind can examine the Discussion, without perceiving the vast disparity existing between the disputants, not so much on the score of tact and ability, as of temper, urbanity, argument, and veracity. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE seemed to find no relief from the burden of his malevolence toward his gifted opponent and the abolitionists of Great Britain, although he discharged an unequalled quantity of bile upon them as often as he addressed his auditors. Being compelled (to use his own confession) to 'rely almost entirely upon mere memory' for his facts,—

for the all-sufficient reason, that he could find no documents to answer his purpose,—he behaved as one madly beating the air, and was filled with guilty confusion and wild desperation. His whole defence is one great, glaring falsehood—one mass of bitter defamation and self-evident contradiction—fierce in its spirit, spiteful in its tone, false in its matter, and unhallowed in its object. Indeed, so utterly destitute is it of truth, and so perfectly suicidal are its general statements, that even the proslavery presses of this country have been deterred from giving it publicity. On the other hand, the fairness, the magnanimity, the good temper, manifested by Mr. THOMPSON, under the most insulting taunts and malicious provocations, must be apparent even to the most prejudiced reader. While Mr. BRECKINRIDGE had nothing better to depend upon than his ‘memory’ to rebut the most solemn and tremendous accusations against the American Church, Mr. THOMPSON sustained those accusations by plenary evidence in the shape of official documents published by various religious bodies in the United States, who are hostile to all abolition movements. The result of the discussion, therefore, was, not only to raise the latter individual to a more exalted height, if possible, in the estimation of British christians, but to deepen their convictions of our NATIONAL guilt, notwithstanding the temerity of Mr. B’s assertion, that ‘there was, properly speaking, *no such thing as American slavery*,’ that ‘it was absurd to talk of it,’ and that ‘it was not an American question’ !!

As it was one of the conditions of the discussion, that no vote should be taken at the close, expressive of the mind of the audience, the Glasgow Emancipation Society delayed convening a public meeting, ‘for the purpose of expressing their own judgment, and calling for the concurrence of their fellow-citizens, till some time had been allowed for the circulation and perusal of the controversy, as issued from the press.’ It was not, therefore, until the 1st of August, 1836, that such a meeting was held in the Rev. Dr. HUGH’S Chapel, at which the venerable ROBERT GRAHAME was called to the Chair by acclamation. Its

object was, in the language of the public advertisement, to ‘express the sentiments of the Society in reference to the recent discussion on American Slavery, so far as Mr. THOMPSON is concerned; *their approbation of his conduct in the United States*; their unabated confidence in him as their Agent; and their unalterable attachment to the great principle of immediate, unconditional, and universal emancipation.’ The audience was numerous and highly respectable. Addresses were made by Drs. WARDLAW and HUGH, and several other gentlemen. The speech of Dr. WARDLAW was one of the happiest efforts of his great and good mind, full of moral sublimity, lovely in its temper, eloquent in its diction, and worthy of all praise. After referring in grateful terms to those friends of the anti-slavery cause in England, who had been most active in achieving the emancipation of 800,000 slaves in the British Colonies, he bestowed the following panegyric upon Mr. THOMPSON :

‘Amongst those to whom, on this ground, obligation ought to be felt and expressed by us, the subject of the resolution I am about to propose to you, holds no inferior place. He exerted a power over the public mind of no ordinary amount. He brought up the cause in our own city, when it had long languished for want of adequate stimulation. He put new life into it; and he kept that life in vigor till the conquest was achieved. We shall not soon forget the triumphant result of his controversy, maintained in this our city, hand to hand, foot to foot, with the phalanx of the colonial interest—headed at that time by their own chosen champion—but a champion whom, for their own sakes, I forbear to name—as I believe they are all as much ashamed of him as we could wish them to be. With the ability, the zeal, the eloquence, the energy, the steadfastness of principle, the exhausting and indefatigable perseverance of our champion, we were more than satisfied. We expressed our satisfaction; and we expressed it not in words merely, but practically. The most decided and flattering proof that can be given of satisfaction with an agent whom we have employed in one work, is to set him to another. We did so. He had done his duty so nobly in the home department of the great cause he had at heart, that, when we had achieved our object in the disenthralment of the slaves in our own dependencies, and we looked abroad upon the world for other fields of philanthropic effort, we naturally and unanimously turned our eyes to him, believing that he who had done so well at home, would do equally well abroad.’ * * * *

‘On the ground, then, the broad ground of universal philanthropy, which allows no man to say, “Am I my brother’s keeper?” we looked to America. On the ground of the Trans-Atlantic States owing their origin to Britain, and being kindred blood with ourselves, we looked to America. On the ground of their having derived their very slavery from us, and having had it fostered by our example, we looked to America. And when thus, in common with our brethren in the Northern and Southern Metropolis, we looked to America and resolved on a mission of benevolence to that

land, all eyes simultaneously looked to George Thompson, as the man, of all others, most eminently fitted for the charge of the important and difficult trust. We sent him to America. He went with the best wishes of the benevolent, and the fervent prayers of the pious. He remained in the faithful, laborious and perilous execution of the commission entrusted to him, as long as it could be done without the actual sacrifice of life—till it would have been the insanity of hardihood to have persisted longer. He returned. We hailed his arrival. We privately and publicly testified our approbation of the course he had pursued. The present question is—are we now prepared to retract that approbation? Has the ordeal through which our friend and commissioned agent has recently passed, altered our minds, and disposed us to substitute for it a sentence of condemnation? Are we now ready to cashier him,—to censure him,—to send him to Coventry,—to deprive him of his commission, and declare him disqualified for ever holding another, unworthy of all future service? I express my own judgment in the shortest of all monosyllables: I say, No; and the resolution which I hold in my hand, calls upon you to say, No. I consider the recent controversy as having yielded only fresh ground for confidence; as having fully proved that the challenge he had issued was no empty bravado, but it was founded in conscious sincerity, in the fullest conviction of rectitude of principle, of truth, of facts, of force of argument, and of a fair prospect, not of mere victory, but of benefit to his cause. I shrink not from saying of him thus publicly, what I have said more privately in the Committee, that I consider him, in this as in former controversies, as having borne himself, in every respect, creditably to his character and to his cause; to have established, to the full, his previous statements; to have successfully vindicated his Trans-Atlantic proceedings; to have justified the condemnation of American colonization schemes; and to have fairly fastened the guilt of slavery on the Government and people of the United States; that I consider him, in a word, as having come out of this seven-times-heated furnace unscathed—without a ‘hair of his head singed, or the smell of fire having passed upon him.’ If this meeting are of one mind with me, they will accept the following resolution:—

‘Resolved, That, in the deliberate judgment of this meeting, the wish announced by Mr. George Thompson to meet publicly any antagonist, especially any minister of the Gospel from the United States, on the subject of American Slavery, or on any one of the branches of that subject, was dictated by a well-founded consciousness of the integrity of his purpose and assurance of the correctness of his facts:—and that the recent discussion in this city, between him and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, of Baltimore, has left, not merely unshaken, but confirmed and augmented, their confidence in the rectitude of his principles, the purity of his motives, the propriety of his measures, the fidelity of his statements, and the straight-forward honesty and undaunted intrepidity of his zeal.

‘I conclude by saying, that, in consequence of the recent discussion, George Thompson, instead of having sunk, has risen in my estimation, both as to personal character and as to official ability and trustworthiness; and never stood higher in my regard than at the present moment.’

Of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Dr. W. said—‘I cannot but condemn the contumelious and sarcastic bitterness of some of his personalities, and *I conceive him to have failed in argument on every point that was worth contending for.* His defence of the ministers and churches of America was feeble, inefficient, and fruitless. *The facts against him were overwhelming.*’

MASSACHUSETTS.

As the message of Gov. EVERETT, of January last, was not laid before the Legislature of this State, in season to be examined in the last Annual Report, it would be unpardonable to suffer that servile document to pass without notice or condemnation, in the present Report. A considerable portion of the message was occupied with the subject of slavery, which was treated in a manner calculated to shock the friends, and to animate the foes of human liberty, universally. ‘In this State, and several of our sister States,’ says the Governor, ‘slavery has long been held in public estimation as AN EVIL OF THE FIRST MAGNITUDE.’ To sustain his assertion, he gravely adds, that the Union could not have been formed, if the incorporation, extension and preservation of this ‘evil of the first magnitude’ had not been expressly guarantied to the South by the North as ‘a point of the highest public policy’! And he further adds, that ‘every thing that tends to disturb the relations created by this compact is at war with its spirit.’ So that whoever undertakes to oppose ‘an evil of the FIRST MAGNITUDE,’ and to call for its suppression, is a disturber of the peace, a recreant American, and, in the opinion of his Excellency, may be ‘prosecuted at common law.’ He soothingly informs the people, that ‘a *conciliatory forbearance* would leave this whole *painful subject* where the Constitution leaves it, with the States where it exists, and in the hands of an all-wise Providence, who, *in his own good time*, is *able* to cause it to disappear, like the slavery of the ancient world, under the gradual operation of the gentle spirit of Christianity.’ And—with marvellous consistency—in order to induce the yeomanry of this Commonwealth *to make a truce with oppression*, he tells them ‘to imitate the example of our fathers,—the Adamses and Hancocks, and other eminent patriots of the revolution, fresh from the BATTLES OF LIBERTY’! He might just as pertinently have cited the example of the Apostles, in their attacks upon ancient idolatry, as a dissuasion from the foreign missionary enterprises of the present day! If, as the Governor affirms, the Constitu-

tion has nothing to do with slavery, but 'leaves it with the States where it exists,' then slavery cannot claim any constitutional sanction or support, and is not 'a relation created by the compact.' Like intemperance, lewdness, gambling, or any other 'evil,' whether of 'the first magnitude' or otherwise, it may be combatted without disloyalty, nay, it may not be tolerated without great criminality. It may be fairly doubted, whether Gov. EVERETT, if he had lived cotemporary with 'the Adamses and Hancocks, and other eminent patriots of the revolution,' would have dissuaded them from fighting 'the battles of liberty,' or mocked them with the assurance that 'an all-wise Providence, in his own good time,' was able to cause their oppression to disappear—and, therefore, they had better 'leave the whole painful subject' with old King George and Lord North!

While in Congress, a few years since, his Excellency made a bold defence of southern slavery, in the following style:

'Sir,' said he, addressing the Speaker, 'I am no soldier. My habits and education are very unmilitary; but there is no cause in which I would sooner buckle a knapsack on my back, and put a musket on my shoulder, than that of putting down a servile insurrection at the South'!!*—'The slaves of this country are better clothed and fed than the peasantry of some of the most prosperous States of Europe'!†—'The *great relation* of SERVITUDE, in some form or other, with greater or less departure from the *theoretic equality* of men, is INSEPARABLE FROM OUR NATURE'!—'Domestic slavery is not, in my judgment, to be set down as an immoral or irreligious relation'!!—'It is a condition of life, as well as ANY OTHER, to be justified by MORALITY, RELIGION, and international law'!‡

If such were the impious sentiments of EDWARD EVERETT in Congress, it is perfectly in character for him, as Governor of this Commonwealth, to say in his annual message—

'The patriotism (!) of all classes of citizens must be invoked to ~~FOR~~ ABSTAIN FROM A DISCUSSION, ~~AND~~ which, by exasperating the master, can have no other effect (!) than to render more oppressive the condition of the slave; and which, if not abandoned, there is great reason to fear, will prove THE ROCK ON WHICH THE UNION WILL SPLIT'!

* So that a system which is full of all uncleanness, robbery, cruelty, oppression and murder, might be prolonged ad infinitum!

† 'An evil of the first magnitude'!

‡ 'Sir, I envy neither the head nor the heart of that man from the North, who rises here to defend slavery upon principle!'—JOHN RANDOLPH, in reply to Mr. EVERETT.

What ! are the people of Massachusetts to be told,—by their own servant, too !—what subjects they may, or may not, examine and discuss ! What ! may *he* stand up in advocacy of the *divine right* of SLAVEHOLDERS, and may not *they*—his own constituents—be allowed to question that right ! What ! is that ‘relation,’ which is ‘inseparable from our nature,’ which is ‘justified by morality and religion,’ and in defence of which the Governor stands ready to shoulder his musket, too delicate, too sacred, to admit of the slightest examination ! What ! must freemen consent to be gagged, because tyrants are exasperated at their liberty of speech ! What ! is FREE DISCUSSION a rock, which, if not carefully shunned, will dash our Union in pieces ! Such are the opinions of our present Chief Magistrate. For intelligent men will observe, that it is *free discussion*—not *slavery*—which he thinks ought to be abandoned ! that it is our remonstrance against the continuance of ‘an evil of the first magnitude’—*not the evil itself*—that threatens the existence of the Union ! What more does the Emperor of Austria, or the Autocrat of Russia, desire, than that his subjects shall ‘abstain from a discussion’ of the principles of civil and religious liberty ? What more did the mother country require of our ‘Adamses and Hancocks,’ than that they should cease to declaim against taxation without representation, and in favor of the inalienable rights of man ? If the people may discuss the subject of human rights only when it is agreeable to the feelings of the tyrant—if they are bound to abstain from its discussion when it exasperates him—then farewell to the hopes of a groaning world ! Yet—a descendant of the pilgrims, and the every day eulogist of our revolutionary fathers—dares to affirm, in a high official capacity, that we, the people of Massachusetts, are solemnly obligated to carry our *patriotism* so far as to be voiceless, tongueless, insensate, deaf and blind, though millions of our fellow-countrymen are held in galling fetters—though we ourselves are outlawed, if hostile to slavery, in one half of our country ! What aggravates his guilt is, that he wrote his message in full view of those dreadful outrages and

sanguinary requisitions, on the part of the South, which are to blacken the pages of American history through all time, but which he had no disposition to rebuke, and found no occasion to mention.

Gov. EVERETT places himself in a fearful attitude, truly. 'There is no cause in which he would sooner buckle a knapsack on his back, and put a musket on his shoulder,' than in defence of that very 'evil' which 'an all-wise Providence, in his own good time, will cause to disappear'!—Thus we have EDWARD EVERETT, 'armed and equipped as the law directs,' *versus* JEHOVAH OF HOSTS! Again: 'Domestic slavery is justified by morality and religion'—yet it is ultimately to disappear before 'the gentle spirit of Christianity.' Here we have RELIGION *versus* CHRISTIANITY!

CALL FOR PENAL ENACTMENTS.

Doubtless, encouraged by the fact, that such a sturdy supporter of slavery filled the gubernatorial chair in this Commonwealth, the Governors of Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, transmitted to his Excellency certain documents emanating from the legislative bodies of those States, to be laid by him before the Legislature of Massachusetts, at its last session. This was accordingly done, but unaccompanied by a single word expressive of surprise or disapprobation on the part of the Governor, in relation to their insolent demands. These documents, requiring the passage of a gag-law in Massachusetts on the subject of slavery, were referred to a joint committee, consisting of Messrs. LUNT and CHAPIN of the Senate, and Messrs. LUCAS, CORBETT and MOSELY of the House.

By order of the Managers of this Society, the Corresponding Secretary (Rev. Mr. MAY,) addressed a letter to the Chairman of this Committee, asking permission to appear before them, and show reasons why there should be no legislative action, condemnatory of the abolitionists. The request was granted; and on the 4th of March, the proposed interview took

place, in the chamber of the Representatives. Of the insolent and despotic manner in which the Chairman (Mr. GEORGE LUNT) behaved on that and a subsequent occasion, the people of this Commonwealth, and the whole country, have already been informed. Nothing could have been more ungentlemanly or outrageous.* The gentlemen who addressed, or, rather, who attempted to address the Committee, (for they were all, more or less, prohibited a free utterance of their sentiments,) were MESSRS. ELLIS GRAY LORING, SAMUEL E. SEWALL, SAMUEL J. MAY, CHARLES FOLLEN, WILLIAM GOODELL, and WM. LLOYD GARRISON. The occasion was one of deep and solemn interest, and drew together a highly respectable audience, ‘made up of refined ladies, (among them the celebrated Miss HARRIET MARTINEAU of England,) members of the Legislature, highly educated men, and religious and moral citizens.’ The speeches were characterized by an earnest spirit, a grave manner, deep feeling, and uncommon intellectual power, in all respects worthy of that great crisis. Posterity will read them with delight and admiration.

In their Report, the Committee eulogize the slavish demands of the South upon the Legislature, to enact PENAL LAWS for the suppression of anti-slavery societies, meetings and publications, as ‘of the most solemn and *affecting* character’—as ‘appeals to our justice as men ; to our sympathies as brethren ; to our patriotism as citizens ; to the memory of the common perils and triumphs of our ancestors and theirs ; to all the better emotions of our nature ; to our respect for the Constitution ; to our regard for the laws ; to our value for the institutions of our country ; to our hope for the security of all those blessings which the Union, and that only, can preserve to us’ !!! They further declare, that ‘the right of the master to the slave is as undoubt-

* Dr. Gamaliel Bradford and George Bond, Esq. (at the second interview,) were so indignant in witnessing his scandalous behaviour, that, though not connected with the anti-slavery cause, they remonstrated in decisive and eloquent terms against such treatment. Hon. Mr. Whitmarsh in the Senate, and Robert Rantoul, George S. Hillard, and G. H. Durfee, Esqs. in the House, declared in their place that the committee were highly blameworthy—Mr. Mosely excepted, who behaved in a very honorable manner.

ed as the right to any other property'—that 'any attempt, whether direct or indirect, to deprive him of this property, as of any other, is a violation of the fixed laws of social policy, *as well as of the ordinary rules of moral obligation*'—that 'his argument, that *the property is his own*, would seem to be unanswerable'—that 'they [the Committee] feel that the conduct of the abolitionists is not only wrong in policy, but *erroneous in morals*'—that it is their duty, 'so far as may be in their power, to recommend those measures which may seem best adapted to stay the progress of the evil'—&c. &c. Moreover, they endorse all the violent and calumnious charges brought against the abolitionists by the South, as strictly applicable. Finally, they append to their Report a string of resolutions, 'expressing their entire disapprobation of the doctrines avowed, and the general measures pursued, by such as agitate the question of slavery'—and urging them 'to leave the whole affair in the keeping of a merciful Providence, who will not require of any man or nation, an unreasonable account'! But they say nothing about the enactment of any PENAL LAWS!

The Report, though ordered to be printed by the Senate, was laid upon the table, to find an eternal sleep.*

IMPORTANT DECISION.

In August last, the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts unanimously decided, in the case of the slave-child MED,† brought by one Mary Slater from New-Orleans to Boston, that '*an owner of a slave in another State where slavery is warranted by law, voluntarily bringing such slave into this State, has no authority to detain him against his will, or to carry him out of the State against his consent, for the purpose of being held in slavery.*' This opinion was delivered by SHAW, C. J.

* At the next election, the Hon. Mr. LUNT could not be re-elected on account of his Report. He could not obtain even a nomination as a candidate for the Senate!

† See the pamphlet, containing the Arguments of Counsel, on both sides, and the Opinion of the Court, in the case of Commonwealth vs. Aves. This suit was prosecuted by that watchful, heroic, unfaltering band, the BOSTON FEMALE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY. It is to WOMAN, therefore, that Humanity owes this great decision. Those indefatigable friends of human liberty, Samuel E. Sewall and Ellis Gray Loring, Esqrs. assisted by Rufus Choate, Esq. conducted the plea for the Commonwealth. The Argument of Mr. Loring was a masterly effort, and has obtained for him no small amount of honorable and enduring renown.

CONCLUSION.

[~~Q~~ We have extended this Report much beyond the limits assigned by us at the outset; and yet,—so eventful has been the past year, so fraught with good and evil to our blessed cause, so crowded with occurrences worthy of being chronicled in these pages,—we have scarcely given a bird's-eye view of what has transpired, or of what immediately remains to be accomplished. Although the progress of anti-slavery principles has been rapidly onward, and the number of anti-slavery converts truly multitudinous—and although a thousand incidents have served to cheer our hearts and strengthen our hands, mightily—still we have preferred rather to dwell upon the formidable obstacles yet to be overcome, and the fearful crisis yet to be encountered, than to recount the number of our triumphs, or indulge ourselves by reposing, even *pro tempore*, upon the toils of the past. It is allowable, indeed, occasionally to stop and survey the ground won from the enemy, by way of encouragement in the strife of Christ with Belial: but it is better always to be occupied with thoughts of new conquests, while the Prince of Darkness retains his supremacy, than to be admiring the trophies we have gathered in our past encounters. It is certainly yet problematical, which of the two deadly antagonists now struggling for mastery in our country, LIBERTY or SLAVERY, will prove victorious. It is yet extremely doubtful, whether our land is recoverable from the terrible maladies preying upon her constitution. While these things are so, it behooves us all to beware how we suffer ourselves to be deluded by the notion, that the danger has passed, and all is safe.

During the past year, Death has been busy in selecting victims of no ordinary worth, of no limited influence, from our long-extended ranks. Among those 'shining marks,' at whom his poisoned arrows have been fatally aimed, are those late venerable and patriarchal philanthropists, MOSES BROWN of Providence, R. I. and GEORGE BENSON of Brooklyn, Connecticut—the latter formerly the President of this Society when it was known by the title of the New-England Anti-Slavery Society. 'They being dead, yet speak.' Three of the Signers of the Declaration of the National Anti-Slavery Convention, have also fallen—THOMAS SHIPLEY and Dr. EDWIN P. ATLEE, of Philadelphia, Pa. (members of the Society of Friends, and pre-eminently distinguished for their active philanthropy and tireless zeal,) and the Rev. DANIEL S. SOUTHMAYD, an early and efficient supporter of the anti-slavery cause. Another strong, unblenching and most lovely coadjutor perished in the youthful yet perfectly mature person of HENRY EGBERT BENSON, youngest son of the lamented George Benson, and late General Agent and Recording Secretary of this Society. On the roll of American philanthropists, the name of this young martyr should shine among the best and brightest—for he hastened his exit by his unmitigated labors to loose the slave from his chains. As the publication of this Report has been delayed, we are called upon to record the loss of another most valuable and widely lamented co-laborer, Miss ANN GREENE CHAPMAN, daughter of Henry Chapman, Esq. and one of the most efficient members of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society. She died suddenly, with the peace of Heaven resting on her brow and the love of God burning in her soul—bequeathing (among other benevolent charities) one thousand dollars to the American Anti-Slavery Society, and her example to mankind—a legacy both rich and rare.

But we can spare these beloved friends. Our trust is not in an arm of flesh, but in the Lord Almighty. It is His glorious prerogative to undo the heavy burden, break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free. 'Hath he said, and shall he not do it? Hath he spoken, and shall it not come to pass?']

To the Corresponding Secretary of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

On reading the account of the last annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, my attention was particularly arrested by that part of Mr. Johnson's speech,* in which he gives an account of a most barbarous murder, of which, he states, he was an eye-witness. As it is reported, it is without name, or date, or place, and no clue is given, by which its truth or falsity can be brought to the test. The Rev. Dr. Dwight, in his poem called *Greenfield Hill*, published in 1794, alludes to a similar case of cruelty in the following lines :

‘ Why streams the life-blood from that female’s throat ?
She sprinkled gravy on a guest’s new coat ! ’

That a murder, equally atrocious, was committed in Georgia, about eight years afterward, Mr. Johnson positively declares. His story, which I took from his own lips, is in substance as follows :—

‘ I am a native of Africa, and belong to the Kisse tribe, who reside in the interior many hundred miles, a six weeks’ journey from the mouth of the Gambia. I was kidnapped when I was about the age of nine years, by persons of the Vey tribe, and was brought down to the coast near Cape Mount, and sold to a Dr. Jennings, who sold me to Capt. Edward Boss of Newport, by whom I was brought to Savannah in the ship *Hunter*, commanded by Capt. Robert Watt or Watts. I was then sold to Commodore Oliver Bowen, who sent me to a Mr. Newman, to learn to work on a farm at a place called White Bluff. In consequence of being whipped, I returned to Commodore Bowen, who moved to Pine Barren, then to Augusta, where he fought a duel with a Major Dennis, by whom he was shot in the hip, and died in about two months. By his will, he set his two slaves, Eliphalet and myself, free at his death. This will, his nephew, Jabez, violated, by selling Eliphalet to a Mr. Severn Jones of Augusta, and keeping me unlawfully as his slave. After a few years, Jabez Bowen was chosen a Judge of the Circuit Court. While he was in Savannah, he bought eleven slaves, took them to Waynesboro’, thence he returned to Savannah, thence to Bullock county, thence on his circuit to Effingham, thence to St. Mary’s. At this place, about the year 1802, there was a dinner party at the house of a Mr. McIntosh. There were at the table, lawyers Bullock and Flournoy, Judge Mitchell, Christopher Olney of Providence, and the mistress or concubine of McIntosh. During the sitting, Mr. Bullock called to Delia, a slave about 17 years of age, to hand him the gravy. She did so, and in doing it, accidentally spilt some of it on the gown of the female at the table. On seeing this, McIntosh rose in great wrath, seized the carving-knife with one hand, and Delia with the other, dragged her to the wood pile, and cut her throat !! She died instantly. Some of the guests, with myself, rushed to the door and witnessed the transaction. Mr. McIntosh dropped the knife, and called for a bowl of water to wash his hands. Mr. Olney, not being used to ‘ their ways,’ immediately called for his horse, and rode off, and was told the next day that he had better return to the North, than find fault with their customs. In a few years, my master Bowen became deranged, and was taken to Providence, thence to Uxbridge by his brother Henry, and put under the care of a Dr. Willard. Some time after that, he became rational, and returned to Providence; became deranged again, and was sent to Philadelphia, where he died. From Providence I ran away to Boston, where I was taken and put in jail, in which I staid seven days, but was sent back to Providence, where I remained a year or two, and was then legally manumitted.’

Here, Sir, we have the particulars of the horrid transaction. If they are true, the fiend McIntosh, was only an imitator of his brother fiend, the St. Domingo planter. If false, the friends of humanity will rejoice, though at the expense of Mr. Johnson’s veracity. Let the investigation be made, and the truth, whatever it is, be made known.

Yours truly,

JOSHUA COFFIN.

* See Proceedings of the Society, page xxvi.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT ITS
FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING.

HELD AT BOSTON, JAN. 25, 1837, IN THE LOFT OF THE STABLE
ATTACHED TO THE MARLBORO' HOTEL.

THE meeting was opened by an appropriate prayer, by Rev. Mr. Fitch of Boston; the President, JOSEPH SOUTHWICK, Esq. of Boston, in the Chair.

The Report of the Board of Managers was called for; when Mr. Garrison, the Corresponding Secretary, rose and apologized for not having been able to submit the Report to the Board, for want of time to prepare it in season; and therefore he alone was responsible for the sentiments it contained.

Before proceeding to the reading of the Report, he also remarked, that there might be some fears, on the part of the audience, in regard to the security of the Loft; but he assured them that the floor was well propped; and he felt gratified with the consciousness that Abolition to-day, as on every day, stands upon a *stable* foundation. (Applause.)

Mr. Garrison then read the Report, which was listened to with profound attention, and received with much applause.

Rev. Moses Thacher moved that the Report be accepted, and printed under the direction and supervision of the Board.

Rev. Mr. MAY said, this Report contained just what was needed in the present emergency. A delusion extensively prevails, on the subject discussed in that document. It is said we cannot touch slavery in the District of Columbia. Sir, we can touch it; and this Report, which so ably maintains the true ground, on this subject, ought to go forth throughout our whole country, with the sanction of this Society.

Mr. THACHER said, he was fully prepared to adopt the motion of Mr. May; and he hoped the Board would take special care that Senators and Members of Congress be supplied with copies of it. It is the very thing we need. It shows us what we

are, and what we must be; and that no man, having put on his armor, can put it off till the victory is won. Sir, the great struggle is yet to come. This is evident from the fact that we meet here. Do 'gentlemen of property and standing' think they can stop the progress of free discussion? I trust that Abolition will this day receive a new impetus. Let this Report be published to the extent of the means of the Society; and if there are not means, means must be raised. Let it be sent through the South, that the despot may learn that 'the thing is certain, and the interpretation sure.

Rev. Mr. BRONSON, of Boston, also sustained the motion in a brief, but very energetic and eloquent manner.

Rev. Mr. GROSVENOR said, I rejoice that, at this crisis, this Report is to go out. It is just what we need. I hope it will be a *Report* that will sound through the State, and reverberate upon the distant hills and mountains! I know from what *mind* it has emanated. Sir, while laboring in this cause in the country, I have found the need of just such a document as this. The grand obstacle is not opposition, but apathy and error in regard to the real ground of danger. This is more to be dreaded than opposition. The impression prevails extensively in the country, that we are in no danger from the influence of Southern slavery. 'It cannot be,' say the yeomanry who inhabit the hills of New England, 'that the liberties of the North are in danger.' That Report is adapted, in every part, to show that they are mistaken. We are just now at the point to which every nation comes before it goes to ruin. Here is our danger. The Report shows it. Congress has trampled upon the right of petition. Shall we here be told that we must not speak aught against those in authority? Then why speak at all? Surely, if we may not call in question the doings of those who make and administer our laws, we are already slaves. I rejoice to know that it is the rising spirit of the country that is to redeem this city. The country are for us. Witness the vote of the General Court, granting us their hall. Shall we not increase the tide, till it rises still higher, till it pours down and covers the highest spires in this city? Sir, it is not the first time that I have been in a barn. When I go back and tell the yeomanry of the country that I have discussed the principles of liberty and the rights of man in a *barn*, in Boston, they will reply, 'That is nothing new to us; we have often discussed the same subject in our barns. We understand it.'

The motion for the acceptance, printing, and extensive circulation of the Report, was carried unanimously; and it was resolved to take up a collection, during the session of the Society, by subscriptions and donations, for the publication of the Report, and other purposes. In speaking upon this subject, Mr. Garrison remarked that the first meeting of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society was held in a barn; and one man said if the meeting had been held in the church, he could have afforded to give only five dollars; but now he was rich enough to give fifty dollars.

Rev. MOSES THACHER asked leave to make a communication to the society now, because he must leave the city before the afternoon session. He had recently received a letter from a lady, who had recently been held as property. Yes, I'll call her a *lady* now—she is in the British dominions, in Halifax—she is a lady there, though she be called a slave here. I have had the pleasure of seeing her, and a more delicate and conscientious lady I have seldom seen. In the letter of which I speak, she requests me to return her thanks to the citizens of Boston, for the advice, counsel, and assistance they had given her, in gaining her freedom. She is now where she can walk abroad, without fear—she has escaped her pursuers—bloodhounds! I feel that a large portion of these thanks are due to those heroic ladies, who were able to maintain unbroken ranks, and secure a judicious retreat for their sister, in the hour

of peril. A flush of shame comes over my cheeks, that there is not a spot in these United States where a fugitive from bondage and degradation can be safe—that such a person, guilty of no crime, must flee for protection to the dominions of a power with whom our fathers, but a little while ago, contended for liberty of speech and of the press.

The Treasurer (Henry G. Chapman, Esq.) gave an abstract of the Report of the receipts and expenditures of the Society, during the past year. The receipts had been upwards of \$3700, of which all but \$89 had been expended under the direction of the Board of Managers.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

FRANCIS JACKSON, Esq. in the Chair—prayer by Rev. Timothy Merritt, late co-editor of the Methodist Christian Advocate and Journal.

Rev. Mr. Grosvenor offered the following resolution :

Resolved, That immediate emancipation being required by God, is a duty, and is safe.

Mr. GROSVENOR said, It is almost an insult to the understandings of this audience, to ask them to listen to evidence of the truth contained in the resolution. Yet, as it is never amiss to refresh recollection, let me refer them to a passage or two of the Bible ; for that blessed book is the corner-stone of the edifice we are building. I would mention the 22d chap. of Jeremiah. I shall read but a few of the first verses, hoping that every person here will read the whole when he goes home. It contains important principles—those which we are inculcating—those which in candor he will be constrained to adopt. ‘ Thus saith the Lord : go down to the house of the king of Judah, and speak there this word. And say : Hear the word of the Lord, O King of Judah, that sitteth upon the throne of David, thou and thy servants, and thy people, that enter in by these gates.’ God here sends a message to a *government*—‘ thou, thy servants, and thy people.’ And this but develops the principles of his own moral government, and as he is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, we may safely infer that he does so now, and that the principles of the divine government apply to us. To us, then, this message comes. Let us hear it : ‘ Thus saith the Lord, execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor ; and do no wrong, do no violence to the stranger, the fatherless and the widow, neither shed innocent blood in this place.’ Here is our authority for Abolition. Here, on this single passage would I stand, and feel secure while the bible stands. But I am surrounded by all scripture—for when has God spoken in a different manner ? When has He said to a government, ‘ do unrighteousness ? ’ All scripture is in unison with this.

Mr. G. proceeded at some length, to show that this doctrine was applicable to our government and people at the present time.

Now as to its being safe. Read a verse or two more. ‘ For if ye do this thing indeed, then ’—what—O, ‘ you will have your throats cut ’ ! What ? will not men hear God ? Will they be scared by their own fears when God assures them of safety ? Is not His opinion better than that of a worm of the dust ? O, I tremble for that man who talks thus. What is he ? Is he a friend of God—a Christian ? NO. He forfeits that character, and I will not acknowledge him as a brother. I am bound to be plain. ‘ Then,’ what ? ‘ shall enter in by the gates of this house, kings, sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots, and on horses, he, and his servants, and his people.’—Prosperity shall attend thee, ‘ then shall thy light break forth ’ (Is. lviii.

8 : in reference to obeying God) ‘as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily; and thy righteousness shall go before thee : the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward,’—read 2 or 3 more verses for yourselves. ‘LIGHT SHALL BREAK FORTH.’ Ah ! that is what is dreaded. But who dreads the light of the morning ? He who under cover of darkness has been plundering his neighbor’s goods. He who has been prowling for prey—he dreads to have the light shine lest his wicked works be reprov’d. ‘Thy health shall spring forth.’ The nation is sick—and how it would hurt it to get well,—all at once ! Why, what is to be dreaded in this ? What infatuation ! ‘O, do let me lie here a little longer,—I am sick, true—but it is so pleasant to be waited on ; to have the attendance of physicians and the sympathies of friends—don’t cure me too quick.’ Yes, our nation is diseased.

Sir, I have been accused of treason. A good Baptist brother minister, in this city, not long since, a D. D. by the way,* said, ‘Why, sir, your movements and designs are treasonable. You are operating to subvert our government.’ I thought my good brother was mistaken, certainly. I thought I was weaving a crown for my country’s glory. Unworthy am I, indeed, but imagination and ardor go beyond ability ; I would fain wreath my country with a crown more illustrious than she has ever yet worn. I would make it of four different materials, ‘Light,’—‘health,’—‘righteousness,’—and ‘the glory of the Lord.’ Out of these four would I weave a crown, and could I approach my country’s person, I would put it on her head. Would I blush then for my country, before admiring Europe ?—would I hang my head in shame any longer before weeping and bleeding Africa ? Would they—would my country—would my God say, I was a traitor ? I believe not. Do not be afraid. When God has pledged his word, we ought to trust him. If he has promised prosperity and honor to the nation that will execute righteousness and do no wrong, but deliver the oppressed, there let us leave the matter, and trust God that all things shall work together for good.

But what if we *do not* as God commands us ? Read the next verse. ‘But if ye will not hear these words, I swear by myself, saith the Lord, that this house shall become a desolation.’ What an awful oath !—what a sanction !—what a curse !

A fact which I remember from Livy has made a deep impression upon my mind.—In one of the wars between Rome and Carthage, in which Gracchus commanded the Roman army, and Hanno the Carthaginian ; Gracchus on a certain day saw that a battle with Hanno, the next day, was inevitable. He did not evade the necessity—but how should he prepare his army ? It was a crisis in the war. That battle would decide whether Rome should continue to be free. He had in his army many volunteer slaves. He called these together and addressed them, ‘To-morrow we meet Hanno. Whosoever shall bring the head of an enemy, shall be a free man.’ A short address—what was the effect ? ‘Lead us forth,’ was the acclamation, ‘now’—they could not wait. He put them off, told them to prepare their arms. At the signal in the morning, they were ready—they marched forth, and, says Livy, ‘these volunteer slaves fought like tigers.’ But word was brought to Gracchus that the battle waned on his part. Why ? ‘Every man has in his left hand the head of an enemy.’ Gracchus exclaimed, ‘throw down your heads and continue the battle, and TO-DAY gives you liberty,’—instantly they obeyed, and inspired with courage more than human, pursued and butchered the enemy till Gracchus called them off. He called them together next morning and—what did he say ? ‘O, I shall have my throat cut, if I let them all

* Mr. G. next day explained that the minister referred to did not now reside in Boston, but in New-York.

loose' ? No. He did not so degrade and level human nature. Kindness melts the heart. He, in the rashness of a modern abolitionist, said, 'Romans ! ye are all free-men.' Now for the comment. What was the influence on the slaves ? 'They rent the sky with shouts, and stretched forth their hands to the gods, and prayed for blessings upon the Roman people.' (Applause.)

AMOS DRESSER now gave an account of the outrage inflicted on him in Nashville, Tenn. His narrative excited much feeling ; especially, his being befriended by the 'stranger' and his wife. Many an eye glistened with emotion when he 'prayed heaven to reward her kindness,' who was willing to share the risk of harboring him in their house. The narrative was substantially the same as has been extensively printed in the newspapers, and need not be here repeated.

Rev. Mr. MAY. Fellow citizens ! Can you believe it ? You must believe it ; for both friends have declared it and enemies have boasted of it. *It has been done*—in our country, and let every body hear it. Let it go forth and sound upon every ear, till every heart is fixed and every *man* resolve to resist such high-handed encroachments upon the rights of freemen. You have heard Dresser. Is he alone ? You are all exposed to just such treatment. There are 10,000 citizens of Massachusetts who would this day be lynched should they list their feelings or their opinions south of Mason & Dixon's line. Why, haven't you heard it ? \$5000 have been offered for that man (pointing to Mr. Garrison,) by the State of Georgia—and \$10,000 (anonymously) for another who once ministered at the altar in this city, (Phelps.) *I* have received threatening letters from the South, surcharged with imprecations of vengeance, and telling me to persist in speaking and writing against slavery at the peril of my head. And why all this wrath ? *Why ? WHY ?* They do not tell us—except that we *speak for liberty*: that here in New England—the cradle of our country's infancy—so near Plymouth rock where Freedom first put foot on our country's shores—here in Boston where first freedom breathed her resistance to oppression—we dare to feel and think and speak and act as our fathers did. If you have *hearts* you must feel, if you have *heads* you must perceive that the foundations of our institutions are being ruined, that liberty's temple totters, and that causes are at work which will, unresisted, effect its overthrow.

We are told to go to the slave states to speak against slavery. I say, we would go if you will insure that we shall be *heard* before we are lynched. There are many who would be martyrs if they could but once proclaim the truth in the ears of slave-holders. But there is no chance of this. Judge Lynch issues his mandate, and every *suspected* abolitionist is seized and condemned untried, unheard. But why go to the South ? Have we not prejudice and persecution and proscription enough to encounter here at the North ? Are things made right here yet ? How is it in New England ?—in our own Massachusetts ? Are outrages regarded as they ought to be ? NO. Are citizens protected as they ought to be ? NO. When we petitioned our legislature, were we heard ? NO. (No ! No ! No ! responded other voices.) Even our Governor, in his message meanly insinuated—that is, said, it was the opinion of many good men, that the abolitionists were abusing the liberty of speech, and ought to be restrained. Had he come out, like a man, and shown his face before election, he might have secured to himself the privilege of retiring to the 'dignified station of a private citizen.' (General Applause.) I do not say this as a political partizan. But I do say that such equivocal sentiments in high places ought to receive rebuke. We placed him there, and instead of insinuating that we were abusing a heaven-born right, he ought to have been the first to throw security around it. And I ask you

now whether we are secured and protected in the liberty of speech? So far from public sentiment being what it ought to be, we could not secure a comfortable place of meeting for this society. We are shut out of every church and hall of any size in the city, and driven to a stable. *Never, NEVER* have I felt so deeply ashamed of this city. I was born here, and have always been proud to say it, but now I am ashamed of my own native Boston. (Applause.) But I rejoice to think that there is a better spirit in the country, a redeeming spirit, and I call upon those who have come from the country to tell the city how it looks, and shame Boston into decency. (Applause.)

But I did not intend to make a speech. I got up to ask you whether you would help to deliver our country from reproach, and help to undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free. Will you give money or pledges to sustain the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society? Will you help us to send forth throughout the country a supply of the *Liberator*—that organ that first began the battle against oppression, and that now is the essential weapon for every thorough abolitionist. (Applause.)

Mr STANTON hoped it would be understood, to what object the present subscriptions were to go. In prosecuting his agency in this State, it had been a part of his business to solicit the payment of pledges made at the last anniversary; and he found that many pledges were made with the expectation that the money was to go to the general cause. What is now proposed goes to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

He would say, too, that he had been greatly retarded in the duties of his agency, by having to turn aside to collect these pledges. The business of an agent is to rouse up the public mind that has never yet been excited, not to go about waking up snoring abolitionists. (A laugh.) He had found that abolitionists the widest awake at an anniversary, get fast asleep as soon as they go home.

As people were moving, he would remind them, before he sat down, of the meeting this evening at the Representatives' Hall. Nor could he refrain from calling attention, for encouragement, to the decided vote by which that place was granted to us. The vote is a fair index to the state of abolition throughout the State. The country members voted for the resolution—the city members against it. Our friends are in the country, and are numerous: and so it is, you see—when *Boston* votes, we go into a *stable*—but when the *STATE* votes, we go into the *STATE HOUSE*.—(Great Applause.)

[It was afterwards stated by a gentleman in the house, that all the Boston delegation did not oppose the resolution. It originated with a Boston member.]

Several pledges and donations were announced, both from individuals and from Auxiliary Societies. Amongst the latter was a pledge of \$100 from the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, *for the support of the Liberator*. (Announced by Mr. May. Applause.)

EVENING SESSION.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, Jan. 25.

Society met in the Representatives' Hall, in the presence of a crowded audience, many hundreds being obliged to go away, for want of room. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Goodman, of Dracut.

Rev. Mr. SCOTT, of Lowell, offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That in view of the success which has hitherto attended the promulgation of anti-slavery doctrines in our land, we should not be disheartened, but thank God and take courage.

The resolution I hold in my hand, said Mr. Scott, takes a view of the past, present, and future. The effects produced by the promulgation of anti-slavery doctrines, so far from dispiriting or discouraging us, should inspire us with new zeal and fresh courage. It is the promulgation of anti-slavery doctrines that has awakened public attention, and produced this mighty movement throughout our land. And what are anti-slavery doctrines? They may all be summed up in one word: *Slavery is sin*, and must be *immediately abandoned*. The principle that one man has a right to make a brute of another, to sell him under the hammer, exchange him for brutes, take from him the Bible, and all means of mental and moral elevation, is fundamentally wrong, whether practised by the good or the bad. No sacredness of character can sanctify it. A minister of the gospel or a deacon of the church, can have no more right than the most vicious man in the community, to make a brute of his fellow-man—of an immortal spirit, destined to the judgment. This principle must be abolished. Make it appear that it is not a bad principle, and then we will cease to contend against it. But, so long as it is admitted to be bad, we will contend that it should be immediately abandoned.

The doctrines to which I have alluded have been promulgated, in spite of opposition and lawless violence, in spite of all the malice of men and devils. It is the success which has attended the promulgation of these principles, which inspires us with fresh confidence in their correctness, and their adaptedness to accomplish the object we seek. Within the last year, there has been 300 per cent. added to our cause. Two years ago, there were but 200 or 250 societies in our land—now there are 700 or 800, and the old ones have been growing in numbers. Our country is awakened; the pulpits begin to be opened. Men of influence are taking ground with us. Notwithstanding the annual meeting of this society has been driven into a stable, there has been success. In the city that I came from, we have recently sent 2300 names to Congress, for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, with almost no effort.

It is said, 'I am an abolitionist, *except the measures*.' What do you differ from what has always been the sentiment of our whole country? Until very recently, nobody has attempted to defend slavery *in the abstract*. But, what has this sentiment amounted to? Slavery has grown up under it till it is now become a great Oak, which defies the storms of public sentiment—ay, the winds of heaven too! But, apply this objection to other subjects. Suppose an individual should say, 'I am benevolent, *except the measures*.' What will it amount to? Every body is willing to say to the poor, 'Be ye warmed, be ye filled;' but when we come to the *measures* for feeding and clothing them, the miser starts back! Such benevolence does no good. Suppose a man should say, 'I am a strong temperance man, *except the measures*.'—What good will he do? It is the *measures*, which have given success to the Temperance Reformation; and so it is the measures that must give success to the anti-slavery cause. Ten or twelve years ago, many benevolent men felt as deeply on this subject as they now do; but their feelings and efforts were scattered. Mr. Jefferson, and William Wirt, and many other patriots and philanthropists, have been opposed to slavery; but what has their opposition amounted to? But the movements of the abolitionists have concentrated these feelings upon one point, where the rays of light will continue to blaze and burn, until a fire is lighted, which will burn up slavery.—Suppose the British Anti-Slavery Society had left off the measures, what would have become of the slaves in the West Indies?

But, it has been said, we are so severe, so harsh, so violent in our language. With respect to severity of language, its propriety depends upon circumstances. If truth

requires the use of severe language, we are justifiable in using it. Jesus Christ and his apostles, and the Reformers, used plain and pointed language. The Declaration of Independence is couched in severe language. Temperance lecturers have used hard language, and sometimes spoken unadvisedly; but, when has this been brought as an objection against the cause they advocate? But is there no palliation in this case? When has a set of men been placed in more trying circumstances than the abolitionists? They have encountered hard speeches, bitter revilings, persecution, violence. It would require them to be superhuman, never to speak unadvisedly, never to say any thing which they ought not to say. But, sir, the severest language ever used by abolitionists, is calling slaveholders men-stealers and robbers. But, if the doctrine contained in the Declaration of Independence is correct, it is true, that every slaveholder is a man-stealer and a robber. What says it? 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are *born equal*, and endowed with certain *inalienable* rights, among which are life, *liberty*, and the *pursuit of happiness*.' Now, if this be a fact, 70,000 children of slaves, *born equal*, are stolen every year, and robbed of their liberty and the right of seeking happiness in their own way. The children at the South are born as free as the children at the North. If they are born *equal*, as the Declaration of Independence declares, they are entitled to the same rights, and every slaveholder, who makes slaves of the children of his servants, is a man-stealer—he steals the children and robs them of their rights—he is a man-stealer and a robber.

I like to hear things called by their right names. Let a robber meet you on the highway, and forcibly plunder you of your money, is it severe language to call him a robber? But, which is the greatest robber, the man who takes my *purse*, or the man who takes *myself*, my wife, my children, and all I have? It was hard language that the pirate used to Alexander.

But, it is said, Abolitionists are obstinate—headstrong; they brave public opinion, &c. But, in maintaining great principles, men must be headstrong and obstinate.—Daniel was obstinate. He was alone, in a strange land, a captive promoted. How important that he should maintain his influence and popularity with the throne, for the good of his nation! The modern doctrine of expediency would have come in well to his aid. He might have said, I *can* worship my God for thirty days, just as well with my windows closed, and then save myself from being thrown into the lion's den, and my nation from the loss of my influence. But, Daniel felt that when his rights and the religion of his God were in danger, then was the time to hold them with a death-grasp.—And so also, the three Hebrew children, as they are called, were headstrong. According to the modern doctrine of expediency, they might have said, 'We can worship our God as well prostrate, as any other way—we will fall down with the multitude; but we will not worship the golden image—we will pray to our God. It is not expedient for us to sacrifice our lives, and go into the fiery furnace, when our influence is so much needed, by our captive brethren.' But, no; they felt that it was the time above all others for them to stand firm. The king was willing to show lenity—he offered to give them another trial; but no—they declared they would not bow down to his image of gold. Sir, Daniel braved public opinion—these three men braved public opinion. If they had followed the modern doctrine of expediency, they would have avoided these dangers; but, it will always be found, as in their case, that the path of duty will come out right. But, take away our measures, and what will be left? We want a sentiment that speaks out.

Mr. H. B. STANTON, offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the District of Columbia, being under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress in all cases whatsoever, the existence of slavery and the slave trade in that District is to be charged upon the people of the free States—is a foul blot upon the character of the nation—and ought to be immediately annihilated.

Resolved, That the refusal of the House of Representatives of the United States to read, refer, or discuss the memorials of THE PEOPLE, praying for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, is virtually a daring denial of the right of petition, and an act of high-handed despotism, which ought to alarm and arouse all the friends of the Constitution and their country, all who value their dearest rights—and which ought to be visited in retribution upon the heads of those recreant representatives who voted in favor of the outrage.

In support of these resolutions, said Mr. S., I shall bring forward but few of the many reasons which might be profitably adduced. The question is often tauntingly put to the abolitionists, 'What have the people of the North to do with slavery? We admit it to be an evil, moral and political—a system of enormous wickedness and cruelty: but why agitate it here?—why do you not go to the South and labor, where the evil exists?' I answer these queries, said Mr. S. like a true son of New England, by putting others. To my opponent, I say, 'You admit slavery to be a sin?' 'Yes.' 'That it ought to be immediately abolished?' 'Yes.' 'That those who have the power, are bound instantly to exercise that power, in its entire abolition?' 'Yes.' 'That they are recreant to humanity, to their country, and their God, if they refuse?' 'Yes.' And now ask what has the north to do with slavery. Look at the District of Columbia, the common capital of this Republic, where 7000 MEN, bearing the image of God, and touched with his immortal fire, are held as goods and chattels, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever! Where exists and flourishes the foulest slave market on the face of the globe! Where men are licensed, at \$400 a year, to sell, at public auction in lots to suit purchasers, native born American citizens, and the money for such license is appropriated to purposes of internal improvement! Where a free citizen of Massachusetts, on business before the national legislature, may be seized and thrown into prison, on suspicion of being a slave, and if he fail to prove himself a free man, may be sold into perpetual slavery to pay his jail fees, and the proceeds of the sale, deposited in the public coffers! Where the slave trader from the coast of Africa, with his crew, may be condemned as Pirates, and hung at the yard arm, while their cargo of 'human cattle' is sold to Franklin and Armfield, the proceeds put into the public treasury, and then the American slave trader may, under the protection of American laws, send them to the New-Orleans market, or sell them in parcels to Republican Senators! What has Massachusetts to do with slavery? Why, the stentorian eloquence of her own Webster, pleading for liberty in Greece and in Texas, is lost in the clamors of the slave auctioneers, shouting, under the very walls of the Capitol, 'How much for a citizen of Massachusetts, sold to pay his jail fees? Going! How much?' Or, the shrill tones of her own Adams, pleading for Constitutional reform, are overpowered by the shrieks of American mothers, torn from their infants, to be sold into distant slavery, desolate and heart-broken. Thus, tyrants laugh at our boasted equality, and the friends of liberty abroad, sink the burning brand of hypocrisy deep into the forehead of the Republic. And who is responsible for all this hypocrisy, treachery, cruelty and crime? THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES. It, according to the U. S. Constitution, has the power of exclusive legislation over the District of Columbia, in all cases whatsoever.—Slavery and the slave trade in the District, are the creatures of law. In 1800, the Congress framed an act, confirming the acts of Maryland and Virginia, in regard to said District, and thus made their acts its own. Therefore, slavery, with

all its abominations, its robbery, its heathenism, its groans, its tears, its blood, its contempt of God, in the imbruting of his image, is the bandy work of Congress. It lives and breathes and riots there, by the express and special permission of the present Congress. Yes, said Mr. S., while I stand here to-night, Congress might shiver every fetter in the District, and its 7000 goods and chattels might stand forth men, redeemed, disenthrall'd, emancipated. Do the Congress refuse? Then, on the admission of my opponent, I brand them as recreant to humanity, to their country and their God.

The *free states* are, in a great measure, responsible for the continuance of this dread evil. They elect a large majority of the House of Representatives—and the majority of the Senate, if we include its presiding officer;—and I call upon the people of the free states, of all political parties, to remember, that their political influence is capital, loaned them by God, to be invested for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia,—that their votes should be pledged to humanity, and their names given freely and immediately, to the cause of the suffering and the dumb.

Is it yet asked, why do the abolitionists agitate this subject before the northern public? To arouse the sovereigns of the nation to command their servants to do this work in the District of Columbia immediately. It is in vain that we look to Congress to arouse, while the people slumber. Its members will not move till impelled onward by public sentiment at home. 'Go to our constituents,' they will say, 'if you would have us act.' We are but the passive quick-silver in the public thermometer. If you would have us mount up to abolition heat, you must warm up the atmosphere,—the people.' And, said Mr. S. we are doing it! We are, by our speeches, our publications, our societies, our conventions and our prayers, kindling up a sacred fire that shall cause the public mind to glow with impartial benevolence, and the servants of the public shall feel its warming influence. Agitate then! The member of Congress is but the index to the opinions of his constituents. His bark floats on the popular tide, and his sails catch the popular breeze. Raise the wind, then, among his constituents. Being but the hands upon the public clock, he keeps time according to the pendulum's stroke. Abolition has its fingers on the pendulum. Says the Representative, 'I am but the weather-cock on the public building, to indicate the course of the wind. If you would have me point South, the wind must blow from the North.' I repeat it, said Mr. S., the abolitionists are raising the northern wind. They are calling it down from every hill-top and mountain in Massachusetts; and the southerners might as well stand upon their frontier, and, catching the northeaster in their fist, chain it to Mason and Dixon's line, lest its chilling influence should fall too roughly upon the delicate bodies of the South, as to arrest the abolition tempest now bursting from the white hills and green mountains, the Wachusetts and Monadnocks of free, unbought, unawed New-England.

Mr. S. next glanced at the motives which should impel us to labor strenuously for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District.

1. If we succeed, the chains would fall from the limbs of 7000 men: our brethren.
2. The internal slave trade, the bloodiest feature in the whole system, would receive a staggering blow.
3. The Capital would be cleansed. Our altars would no longer smoke with human sacrifices; and there, Liberty might unveil herself to adoration, unspotted with human gore.
4. But these are minor considerations compared with the mighty moral effect of this work. The abolition of slavery in the District, would be like a mill-stone around the neck of the whole system of slavery, which would soon drown it in a sea of popular abhorrence. Such an act would be the verdict of the

whole people in condemnation of slavery, pronounced by the highest legislative court of the nation. It would be AMERICA, deliberately judging slavery to be worthy of death. The system could not survive the sentence five years. Well has the Hon. Mr. Preston, of South Carolina, said, that 'the question must be met here; for the District is the main gate at the entrance of the citadel; it is the bridge over the moat,—and every aggression here must be resisted.' Ah, said Mr. S., I respond to the eloquent Senator, that it is indeed the main gate; it is truly the bridge over the moat, and girded in the panoply of Heaven, and led onward by the same moral Buonaparte, we will assault that gate until it falls, and then, through that gate, and over this bridge of Lodi, we will march such an array of moral power, as will take captive the intellect, the sympathy, the conscience, the soul of the entire South. 5. Recent events in the House of Representatives of the United States have clothed this question with vital importance. Every man in the nation, in his own person, is deeply interested. The District of Columbia has become the Thermopylæ of American freedom. But for this, I would not have detained this assemblage a single moment. On the 18th inst. the House passed the following resolution :

'Resolved, That all petitions, memorials, resolutions, propositions, or papers, relating in any way, or to any extent whatever, to the subject of slavery, or the abolition of slavery, shall, without either being printed or referred, be laid upon the table, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon.'

By this act, they have virtually denied to the people the right of petition. By the 1st article of the amendments to the United States' Constitution, it is declared that 'Congress shall make no law * * abridging * * the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.' Mark the words ! 'no law *abridging*.' If our memorials are not read nor referred, but thrown aside, unnoticed, among the waste paper of the House, is not the right '*abridged*?' Yea, it is virtually annihilated. Mark again ! 'Shall make no law abridging the right of *the people*,' &c. Does this mean that '*the government*' may decide *what* for and *when* '*the people*' may petition ? That the people shall exercise their rights only when the *government* please ? Is the will of our servants, the tenure by which we the people hold our rights ? And is not the right of petition not only abridged but virtually denied, when, if we petition on a certain subject, our memorials are not even read, or referred, so that their contents may be known ? The vital essence of this constitutional guaranty is, that we the people may petition for what we please. We are the sole judges. We are to decide what are grievances. In this particular, every man is a sovereign, the sole arbiter of his own choice. And Congress, who are but the hired men of the people, are bound to give his petition a respectful hearing.—After they have read and considered his memorial, then, and not till then, are they competent to decide whether or not the thing complained of be a grievance. The genius of our government, and all precedent, determine this to be the invariable rule.

And why are the Abolitionists made an exception, and their memorials thus treated ? Evidently because they are the minority, the weaker party, and under the ban of popular proscription. Strange reason ! To abridge the rights of such a party, and for such cause, establishes a principle at war with the end and object for which the Constitution was framed. Constitutions are framed to protect minorities in the exercise of their rights. Those who have few natural safeguards,—the weak, the proscribed, the unpopular—they need the shield of Constitutional protection. The strong, the popular, the majority, those who have numerous natural safeguards, do not need Constitutional protection. Their strength, their popularity, shield them from aggression. Constitutional guaranties, then, are the sworn guardians of the weaker party. Hence, the guaranty in

the 1st Article of Amendments is *our* guaranty: it was made to meet just such a cause as ours. And the House of Representatives, by abridging our right of petition, has stabbed the vitals of the Constitution. By denying this right to the humblest, to be exercised freely and fearlessly, they have tarnished the glory of the Constitution — They have made it a rotten parchment not fit to be trampled in the mire. Its beauty, its harmony, its admirable adaptation of part to part, are gone, and it has become an engine of oppression.

Furthermore, the principle established by this resolution, when legitimately carried out, leads to universal despotism. Where is this abridgement of the right of petition to end? Where, and only where, Congress shall please. They have assumed to themselves the right to determine, concerning what matters the people shall petition. They have kindly taken upon themselves the burden of deciding what are and what are not the people's grievances. They have, from pure love to the people, put the hooks into the nostrils of the democracy. Ah, truly—the servant has turned lord;—and all for the good of his lordship! But there's one, who spurns their collar, and cries, 'TO THE RESCUE!' And will THE PEOPLE falter?

'Is the old Pilgrim spirit quenched within us?
Stoops the proud manhood of our souls so low,
That Mammon's lure or Party's wile can win us
To silence now?

No—when our land to ruin's brink is verging,
In God's name, let us speak, while there is time!
Now, when the padlocks for our lips are forging,
SILENCE IS CRIME!

Yes,—the principle involved in this act of Congress, is a locomotive which will drag the rights of all parties to ruin. Petitions relating to slavery may be proscribed to-day:—but, the same arbitrary power will proscribe petitions relating to the Currency to-morrow; and the Public Lands the next day; and the transportations of the Mails the next; and soon, the Tariff is a subject too delicate to be touched by the rough hands of the people;—and then, Congress may declare their own acts infallible, throw petitions for their repeal back into the faces of the people, decree themselves a perpetual assembly, cut the constitution into shreds, and bid defiance to the popular will.—Ay, by submitting tamely to one aggression after another, the popular will may become subservient, and the mass of the people bow the neck,

And kiss the yoke in kindness made,
And clank their needful chains together!

How easy is it to bring *any* subject under the Congressional ban! Only get up an excitement about it; mob its friends; proclaim Lynch law without benefit of clergy, for all who dare to open their lips in its favor, and the work is done. Congress proscribes the memorialists, hurls their petitions under the table; and says to the people, 'Speak only when your masters please.' Detestable doctrine! Odious tyranny! 'I'd rather be a dog and bay the moon, than such a' Republican. The resolution of the House is despotism, full grown and to the life. And it is a mean despotism. It is saying to us, 'You may petition *if* WE please.' And who says it? The hired men of the people. The servant has slammed the door of the palace in the face of the Sovereign. It is time the men who voted for this resolution, were sent back to the honorable station of private citizens. They are recreant to the trusts confided to them. They are worse than sleeping sentinels; they have turned their arms against

the citadel they had sworn to defend; **THEY ARE TRAITORS.** Let the watchword then be, *Onward to the Rescue!* Our reliance, under God, is in **THE PEOPLE.** The working men are honest. They have identified themselves with us—They control the popular will. The pretence of the Commonwealth will rally; and ecclesiastical tyranny shall be buried in the same grave with political treachery. Then let the Legislature of the Commonwealth protest, in the name of holy freedom and impartial righteousness, against this alarming usurpation of power. Let them protect the weaker party, in the full, free and unawed exercise of their rights. Let ‘*Toleration to the minority, Free Discussion,*’ be written on all their acts, and then this persecuted and despised minority shall,

‘Prayer-strengthened for the trial, come together:
Put on the harness for the moral fight,
And with the blessing of their Heavenly Father,
MAINTAIN THE RIGHT!’

[Here the disturbance about the doors became so great that the speakers could not proceed. After a short pause, however, during which the resolutions passed, Mr. Stanton made a bold and successful attempt to chain the attention of the audience; and held them in almost breathless attention as long as he chose to address them. If there were any *mob spirits* in the house, they were taken by a *coup de main*, and completely routed. The reporter, however, made no attempt to report this part of his speech, for the same reason, that he would not attempt to report a whirlwind or a thunder-storm. After Mr. S. sat down, it being after nine o’clock, a notice was read, that Mr. Dresser would address the ladies’ meeting next day. The name of Dresser was immediately responded by the audience—‘Dresser! Dresser now!’ so that he was forced to come forward. He repeated his narrative, which was listened to with attention and deep emotion.]

ELLIS GRAY LORING, Esq. of Boston, offered the following resolution, which, he observed, had been handed him since he entered the meeting :

Resolved, That true allegiance to his country, to liberty, and to God, requires that every man should be an Abolitionist, and openly espouse the anti-slavery cause.

When any man or set of men differ from the majority on questions of important practical bearing, a respect for the feelings of that majority should make them solicitous to state the reasons for their opinions. Repeated and vigorous have been the efforts of Abolitionists to make known their sentiments, and the grounds of them. These efforts have been partially successful. But seldom has so favorable an opportunity as this presented itself, for making known our views. Now, every man may have his particular reasons for his abolition faith. I state my own. So far as I am known, I believe it is conceded that I have sustained the character of a moderate man. I propose, then, to state some of the reasons why I, as a moderate and cautious man, have found it my duty to be an Abolitionist.

1. Nothing in the *Constitution* of the United States forbids it. There is a great deal of loose assertion on this point. One man finds abolitionism to be contrary to the *letter*, another, to the *spirit* of the Constitution. Surely it was ‘to *secure the blessings of liberty,*’ that the Constitution was formed. But it is well known that there is not one word in the Constitution which forbids the discussion of slavery.—The existence of slavery is recognized there, but only incidentally and as a matter of fact. But can any one force out of it a prohibition of this discussion? I defy him to produce the clause. Abundant evidence might be given to show, that the framers

of the Constitution supposed that the provisional clause in the Constitution for the suppression of the foreign slave trade, would also effect the extinction of domestic slavery. Our most eminent statesmen of that period never anticipated slavery's being permanent in the country. What would Franklin have thought of the modern doctrine, that slavery is too sacred to be assailed by the moral influence of the free ?

2. Is there any thing in the laws, to prohibit my advocating anti-slavery doctrines? No; we challenge our opponents to arraign us, not before Judge Lynch, but before the impartial courts of our country. Abundance of vague menaces have been thrown out on this subject, and it has even been hinted from high places, that we have been guilty of a crime indictable at common law; but no one has yet had the temerity to try this issue with us before the legal tribunals.

3. Again, I find nothing *morally wrong*, in taking part in the great abolition movement. It is certainly morally right to endeavor to rectify an acknowledged wrong, by peaceful means. Abolitionists reject all weapons, but truth and argument. To justify our struggle for the oppressed, we surely need not look beyond the injunction, to do to others as we would have them do to us.

4. The only remaining questions are, Is it *expedient* to agitate this question ? Are our means wise and well-timed ? Is there no danger to be apprehended from them ? In my limited observation, I have found it far safer to do right than people are apt to imagine. Our republican institutions are based upon the abstract principle that it is, in the long run, safe to do right. Our fathers fought for a threepenny tax on tea—it was not a matter of money for which they contended, but an abstract principle.

Now, Sir, I have seen that, in the history of our country, just so far as we have adhered to great principles of abstract right, our country has been great and glorious; and just so far as we have disregarded the principles of theoretic right for the sake of expediency and safety, we have been involved in disgrace and disaster.

Seven years ago, the question of the abolition of imprisonment for debt was strongly agitated in this Commonwealth. I was one, (and I speak it with regret,) who opposed that reform from the fear that the experiment would be unsafe. But, I have acknowledged my error, and I am sorry that I was ever found among those who fear to trust the operation of the great principles of right. Imprisonment for debt was abolished, and the results have been good. Some are afraid of producing insurrection among the slaves, by carrying out abstract truth. But let us look at facts.—Three years ago, it was said by the planters of the British West Indies, that immediate emancipation was not safe. ‘What,’ said the Jamaica planter, ‘let loose the negroes here, where they are to the whites as 25 to 1!’ What said the people of Antigua, where the slave population was as 18 to 1? ‘Insurrection!—murder!—bloodshed!—ruin!’ Antigua was conspicuous among the Islands for its predictions of violence and disaster. But, the great measure passed, and when the question was put to Antigua, whether emancipation should immediately become the law of the land, and they become immediately entitled to the compensation, or whether they would adopt the seven years’ apprenticeship, they chose the former. In that great colony, all the slaves were emancipated in a single day, and put under no more restraint than the laws which govern the white population; and what has been the consequence?—Every thing has there gone on harmoniously, so that the planters have found emancipation *profitable*, independently of the compensation received for their slaves. In that island, for many years, the Christmas holidays had not passed off without disturbance among the slave population; and these festivities had long been guarded by a large military force. But, on the year of the complete emancipation of the slaves,

all apprehension of disturbance had so entirely ceased, that it was not deemed necessary to call out a single soldier; and that day never before passed off so free from disorder of every kind. The admirable success of the English emancipation, cannot much longer be kept from the knowledge of this community, by the arts of those who fear and hate the light of truth. It is but a few days since a merchant in this city, told me that there would be failures among a certain class of speculators, in consequence of their large purchases of sugars. 'How,' I asked, 'will this cause failures?' 'Why,' said he, 'it was generally understood, (a while ago,) that the crops would in great measure fail in the English Islands, in consequence of freeing the negroes; and people therefore went very largely into the sugar business, under the expectation that prices were to rise. But instead of that, the crops have turned out better than they did before the emancipation; which is very unlucky for some people.' Very lucky, thought I, or very providential, for others.

This, Mr. President, was incidental and perfectly unconscious testimony to the cause of immediate emancipation. It came not from an Abolitionist, but from one of the large class who think much of Sugars,—little, I fear, of the slave.

To do *rightly*, is true prudence. The best policy is to be just, and there is at least a presumption that we shall find it safe. But we are called upon to *prove* the expediency of agitating this question. Now, if we show that slavery is a great wrong, and that we only mean to use peaceable means for its removal, it is the business of our opponents to show that our course is inexpedient. Perhaps the most common objection is, that our efforts will dissolve the Union. There are always apparent dangers opposed to doing right. The course of duty is certainly not strewn with flowers. It sometimes abounds with sacrifices and is full of suffering. But it is, on the whole, the path of peace. It must not be forgotten, too, that there are dangers on the other side. I am of those who believe by far the greatest danger to be there. If we are to wait till all appearance of danger disappears, what great work of Reform will ever be commenced or accomplished on earth? Is it settled that we are never to act, where there may be danger?

This cry about the dissolution of the Union, carries not much credence with me. It has become stale. It has been the cuckoo song of the South, ever since the formation of the Union. We have heard it so long, it ceases to startle us. I am not so easily made to believe that the discussion of slavery will dissolve the Union. I have too much confidence in the practical wisdom of our southern brethren, to believe that they will adopt a measure from which they have every thing to lose, and nothing to gain. Believe it not.

What then will they lose, by severing the ties which bind the North and South?—They will lose the physical force of this Union, which is now at their command, to maintain their tranquillity. It rests with the military force of the United States, to quell insurrections. The bayonets of the nation are at the back of the slaveholder, to protect his assumed right of property in his slaves.

But they would lose our protection in another form. *Now*, the Northern States are bound by a constitutional provision, to restore the fugitive slaves of the South.—The state of Virginia contains between one-fourth and one-fifth of all the slaves in the Union; and her whole north-western line borders on free States. Will Virginia give up the national bond, and become the frontier state of the new Southern confederacy? If the Union were dissolved, would free Pennsylvania and Ohio, or any other of the border states, act the part of kidnappers for the South? With the exasperated feelings which must precede a dissolution of the Union, should we aid them one

lot, in trying to hold their slaves? No. The South would lose the protection they now have from the Constitution, in regard to runaways. Their bondmen would pass over the line and be free. The whole *property* of the South, so to speak, would get up, some morning, and *walk off*.

But what would the South *gain*, by a dissolution of the Union? Will she gain exemption from anti-slavery discussions and anti-slavery doctrines? Mr. Preston, of South Carolina, admitted, on the floor of Congress, that all the literature of the world, the whole religious sentiment of Christendom, all philosophy, were opposed to slavery. Do our Southern friends intend to shut all this out? Will they draw about them a *cordon sanitaire* to exclude the literature and philosophy and religion of all the rest of mankind? This is somewhat difficult in the nineteenth century. Mr. Preston gave an account of the origin of the anti-slavery mania abroad. It began with a few obscure individuals in England. Now, said he, a man cannot be in the cabinet who is not an abolitionist. So in France. The officers of anti-slavery societies in France, are cabinet ministers. What did Mr. Preston propose? Alas! that the Southern States should hug the institution, and stand up against the world. This, Mr. President, is easier said than done. If the North would do its duty, every Southern man would go back from his visits to the free States, humbled and thoughtful, a missionary in the cause of freedom.

But there is another difficulty among Mr. Preston's friends. They find they are not sound at home. One half the slaveholders in Virginia were a little while ago talking about abolishing slavery. The storm of opposition to anti-slavery movements has hushed their voices for a while; but let the tempest raised by their own demagogues subside, they will again be heard. There is a party at the South, who will not submit to the doctrines of McDuffie. At the head of this party is Mr. Clay, who has recently openly avowed his repugnance to the new doctrine of the South, on this subject. No; the real danger lies nearer home. The advocates of slavery find a great and growing antagonist in the consciences of slaveholders themselves. One of the most distinguished men of South Carolina, on receiving a copy of Dr. Channing's work on Slavery, committed it to the flames; and on being remonstrated with, for so illiberal an act, replied to a friend of mine who was present, that he was afraid it would fall into the hands of his daughters, and that its specious eloquence might create uneasiness in their minds. Gen. Duff Green is a man of far reaching views. He has lately been appointed editor of the 'Southern Review,' a work got up to sustain the present position of the South. He has, in a labored article, exhibited the true ground of their fears. I will read an extract:

'We are of those who believe the South has nothing to fear from a servile war.—We do not believe that the Abolitionists intend, nor could they, if they would, excite the slaves to insurrection. The danger of this is remote. We believe that we have most to fear from the organized action upon the consciences and fears of slaveholders themselves; from the insinuations of their dangerous heresies into our schools, our pulpits, and our domestic circles. It is only by alarming the consciences of the weak and feeble, and diffusing among our people a morbid sensibility on the subject of slavery, that the Abolitionists can accomplish their object. *Preparatory to this*, they are now laboring to saturate the non-slaveholding states with the belief that slavery is a sin against God; that the "national compact" involves the non-slaveholders in that sin; and that it is their duty to toil and suffer, that our country may be delivered from what they term its blackest stain, its foulest reproach, its deadliest curse.'—Mr. President,—I wish our Northern opposers had the candor to represent as fairly our object and measures.

But, it is said, your means are inadequate—you have not legal authority; nor have these, your advocates, an opportunity of speaking to the South directly. It was the remark of a wise man, ‘Let me make a nation’s ballads, and I don’t care who makes the laws.’ Give us tongue and pen, and I don’t care if all the laws of all the oppressors on earth are against us. Give us a fair field, and we will overthrow slavery. People underrate the efficacy of discussion. What good will your talking do? say they. I reply: Did you ever hear of any great reform which was *not* brought about by talking? Certainly, the strangest remedy for a great wrong like slavery, I ever heard proposed, was, never to say a single word about it. Look at the reformation in the church; at the abolition of the African slave trade; at the abolition of slavery in Great Britain. These reformations were set on foot by *talking*. Thought is greater and elder than action; and when the public mind is sufficiently prepared, by discussion, the legitimate action follows, of course. We have just the means in our hands that have effected all reformations. Look at the first awakening of public sentiment in regard to the African slave trade. The whole world was slumbering over its enormities. Even religion tolerated it. The great and good John Newton wrote home from the coast of Africa, while pursuing this business, which is now outlawed as piracy, that he had been enjoying sweet seasons with his God! A quiet student in a University was appointed to write a theme; and the subject given him for his task, by his professor, was the African slave trade. He studied the subject; began to collect matter; his soul kindled at the enormities that met him; he imparted his knowledge and poured forth his feelings into kindred bosoms. The advocates of the abolition of the slave trade, among his humble friends, at length numbered twelve. The great men, the rulers, the ‘wise and the prudent,’ stood aloof; the commercial interests, the religion of the nation,—every thing seemed against them. But they persevered, in the midst of obloquy and opposition; they talked, they wrote, they went on ‘conquering and to conquer.’ After a twenty years conflict, the slave trade was overthrown. That student was THOMAS CLARKSON. Posterity looks upon such men and deeds in a vastly different light from contemporaries. Five or six years ago, a poor and solitary individual of the working class came among us, with nothing to depend upon but his God, and the native powers which God gave him. He raised the thrilling cry of immediate emancipation. His encouragement was at first small indeed. But the grand, the true, the vital idea of immediate freedom to the slave, burned bright within him, and supported him. He, too, at length, had his twelve associates, and the first Anti-Slavery Society was formed. From this small beginning, and owing mainly, I believe, under God, to the clear vision, the purity of character, the energy, and the intrepidity of that individual, our cause has advanced till it numbers 800 societies. An Anti-Slavery Society has been formed in the United States every day, for the last two years. There are 300 societies in the single state of Ohio, one of which numbers 4000 members. Yet, the individual who started this mighty movement is rejected and scorned by the great and little vulgar of our day. No matter. Posterity will do justice to the name of WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON. (Tremendous and long continued applause.)

But, the fact is, those who condemn our means can have little studied human nature or history. The apostle Paul was taunted with relying on the *foolishness of preaching*. Which is the more powerful, the sword or the pen? Public sentiment is the great moving power; and public sentiment—what is it, but the opinions of you and me, Mr. President, and of the men and women round us in the community? Ay, sir, of women too, I say. The Hon. Balie Peyton, of Tennessee, was lately talking

on this subject with a friend of mine, and remarked that he did not like these abolition petitions that the women signed—some affected, he said, to despise them; but he regarded them in a very different light. These women, sir, said he, have the education of the rising generation, and the youth of our country will be brought up from their cradles like Hannibal, to swear on their domestic altars, eternal hatred to Slavery.—(Great applause.)

But we concede too much, when we say we have no power to act. Look at the 26,000 slaves, in the District and Territories under the jurisdiction of Congress. Has the North nothing to do with them? Sir, we as a nation, hold these 26,000 slaves. We are responsible for their bondage, because they are held under the authority of laws made by our representatives. Perhaps, looking at the millions who are suffering under American tyranny, some may scorn to notice these 26,000 slaves. But we regard it as a matter of no small moment, that our national metropolis is converted into a great slave mart, where men, and women, and children are sold like cattle.—When we know that there are in the District of Columbia, grated prisons to store slaves, intended for the southern market,—principally young persons, groaning in these prisons, torn forever from their homes and the bosoms of their parents—and that all this is done under the laws of Congress, made by our representatives; that the public prisons of the District, which we, here in Massachusetts, help to pay for, are made the reception of human beings, destined for this cruel traffic; when we know that the slave trade between Washington and New-Orleans is carried on by a line of packet vessels, as regularly as the trade between New-York and Liverpool, the subject assumes a form in which we have a direct personal right and responsibility. Who is there who will pretend that we have no right to speak out on this subject? If our way is not right, what is right? We have become a party to these enormities, and we shall continue to be partakers of the guilt, unless we lift up our voices in the strongest remonstrances against them.

But, gentlemen say we use very intemperate language. When our lecturers are speaking on this subject, they speak out of full hearts. Their minds are brought daily in contact with the atrocities of the slave system. Would it be strange that they should use strong language? Will you, who are a Whig or a Democrat, abandon your party because some of its members use violent language? The fact is notorious, that political editors and political speech-makers are daily in the habit of using denunciation and abuse, which far transcends our vocabulary of invective, yet, who ever heard any one objecting to the principles of either of the political parties of the day, on this ground? 'O, but,' I am reminded, 'you are defeating your object by your violence.' I have always remarked that they who are most troubled lest we should defeat our object, are precisely the persons who wish with all their hearts to have it defeated. There may, however, be some good and conscientious men, who stand aloof from us, on this very ground. But, I ask, whether these same men deny all co-operation with the political parties of the day, on account of their violence? I have very seldom heard of such persons. I ask, whether, in carrying forward any great object, we are to wait till we can get men as agents to carry it on, who are infallible? We seek men of the right stamp—we look for honest men—men of principle—and we trust that, out of good and honest hearts, there will not come much wrong. But if we are to wait till we get perfect agents, we must leave slavery to work its own cure, in rivers of blood.

'But, you exasperate.' And what does that prove? Does it follow that, because a man is exasperated, no good is done? When cool reflection returns, the truth will

reach the conscience. Nothing exasperates an uneasy conscience so much as truth. Can any one tell me when the South will feel any less exasperated at the discussion of slavery than now?

But, again, 'you increase the sufferings of the slaves.' Here is a worse libel on the slave-master than any thing the abolitionists have ever said. Are slaveholders indeed such an inhuman, brutal set of men, that they will wreak their vengeance for the misdeeds of the abolitionists upon the poor defenceless slaves? Abolitionists have not said any thing like this. I will not, I do not believe this aspersion. I have made many anxious inquiries of slaveholders and others, who have been at the south; and so far as I can learn, the fact is, that the slaves are better treated than formerly, and for this reason: The masters know that, if they abuse their slaves, it will some how or other get to the ears of the abolitionists, and will be a swift witness against them. I know that the more respectable slaveholders have kept the violent in check, by this consideration. But, I call upon those who object so much to the language of abolitionists, to answer this question to their own hearts: Is it our words, or our principles, which offend you? I fear that many who object to our phraseology, are those who are reluctant to have the real character of slavery brought to light. I am sure the objection often comes too, from men, well-meaning perhaps, but men who have no realizing conception of what slavery is; who do not make the case of the slave their own; whose sympathy is very cool for their black fellow-man. Our ardor seems unreasonable to such men, and if we speak half the truth of that system of tyranny and pollution which disgraces our land, they think our language harsh and exaggerated. But why are they not as sensitive on other subjects? Simply because their hearts are in these, on one side or the other. I read abuse in political papers, far exceeding any thing said or written by abolitionists; yet no sensation is created—no excitement—no mobs, on account of the violent language of political partizans. No; it is our principles, more than our words, that form the real stumbling blocks. Will not something be pardoned, in free Massachusetts, to the spirit of liberty?

'But, why don't you use mild language? Is it the way to persuade men, to call hard names?' Persuasion is not at all times our first object. When we wish to persuade, we employ the gentle pen of Angelina Grimke. But, if we wish to rouse the North, and this we avow to be our first object,—we speak in a harsher key. We mean to hold up slavery in all its loathsomeness—we mean to make it base and odious—to make every man, woman and child in New-England feel that it is so. For this purpose, our language must be sometimes *rough hewn*—we can't use fine instruments.

'But, what is your plan?' says one, 'give us your plan.' Yes, our enemies would be very glad to get us into the warfare of details and local measures. We might contend about these for a century, and nobody would be the wiser or the freer;—the master would sit secure in the enjoyment of his wealth in human bones and sinews. We say to the slaveholders: we give you our general plan, which is to 'do justly, and love mercy.' We leave all the rest to you; if you think our advice dangerous, appoint your special constables, commission your stipendiary magistrates, arrange the details to suit yourselves, for you best know your own needs; but do *the thing*—have it somehow or other done, and done at once. Where there is a will, there is a way.—'Ah, but this is all visionary—extreme—impracticable.' So far from it, [that any man who will devote half an hour to reading documentary evidence, may satisfy himself that it is not only practicable, but the only practicable mode of emancipation. Its practicability and safety have been abundantly proved by experience, in all parts of

the world, and under the most diverse circumstances. Gradual measures, the necessity of preparation for the slave, projects of melioration—all these are delusive pretexts for perpetuating this unrighteous and oppressive system. Those great men, who assisted in the formation of the Constitution, Dr. Rush, John Jay, and Franklin, went home from that work, and formed societies for the abolition of slavery, not, be it remarked, for its abolition in their own State only, but throughout the country. But, as they adopted the principle of gradual emancipation, they effected comparatively little. So long as you acknowledge the master's right to hold his fellow beings as property *for the present*, he is not very solicitous for the future. You may say as much as you please about the duty of emancipation at some future time. It does not touch his conscience or his pocket. The societies which were formed by those venerable men, were little felt or noticed, because they rested upon no deep and vital principle. But the adoption by the anti-slavery societies of the present day, of the principle of immediate emancipation, has thrown the whole South into a ferment.

But, Mr. President, suppose it to be admitted that abolitionists may sometimes lose temper, and sometimes lack taste; that their views and measures are not uniformly marked with judgment and good sense; these circumstances should constitute a stronger call on those who deem themselves more judicious and temperate, to come into the ranks of men whose general object they cannot but approve, and who may be benefitted by their counsels. The current objections to the abolitionists as a party, can have little weight in determining the course of any reflecting man. I would ask such a one to look at what the abolitionists have done and are doing. I ask him to look at eight hundred Anti-Slavery Societies formed in five years; to consider that we have seventy lecturing agents in the field; that Congress is now shaken by almost weekly conflicts connected with our efforts; that the Texas question is lowering ominously on our borders, and may, at any time, convert the whole country in three weeks into two well defined parties, pro-slavery and anti-slavery; that every city and village in the whole nation is more and more stirred up on the slavery question. I would ask, do you believe all this excitement is to subside? Or do you not rather see that the great issue is made up in our land, between Slavery and Freedom—and that one or the other must fall? Very soon your side must be taken, be your fears or your scruples what they may. Massachusetts, and the other free States, will soon be compelled by the force of circumstances—or rather by that Providence who shapes our ends—to occupy their true position. Is there a death-struggle to go on in this land, between Liberty and Slavery, and does any man doubt on which side Massachusetts will be arrayed? It is idle to question it. The moral contest which is growing warmer and warmer, must sooner or later be substantially a sectional one. No man in this part of the Union can long be neutral in this contest. And, thank God, the true spirit is rising; not so much in the cities indeed! Our progress is comparatively little known there,—but before long a voice will be heard from the country that will startle our sleepers. In the words of a distinguished journalist, ‘the nation has been winnowed to furnish men of the most unquenchable enthusiasm and the most obstinate constancy, to carry forward the cause. Violence merely serves to exalt and inflame the ardor with which they pursue their object. Those who administer it are merely chafing the ears of the bull-dog who has fastened upon his prey.’ Under God, and in the truth, we feel that we are invincible.

I move, Sir, the adoption of the resolution.

On motion of Rev. Mr. ST CLAIR of West Boylston :

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society tender to this House of Representatives, for the use of their Hall this evening, their hearty and sincere thanks.

THURSDAY MORNING.

Thursday, 9 o'clock, A. M., ISAAC WINSLOW, Esq. in the Chair.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. FITCH.

Rev. Mr. NORRIS of Bradford, offered the following resolution :—

Resolved, That while the cause of Abolition preserves the most unbroken harmony throughout the ranks of its numerous friends, it promises the only safe remedy to slavery, and produces insurrections only among slaveholders at the South, and the enemies of liberty every where.

Mr. N. said, It is consoling to my mind, that in the midst of commotion in the religious world, the abolition community has always been united. One sentiment pervades this brotherhood, that of benevolence and sympathy. We are not made up of ambitious political jugglers and smugglers—but abolition originated with the best friends of God and the purest spirits in the land. Hence their union. We are not distinguished as a political party. Our distinction is, that we plead the cause of God and of humanity throughout the world. Having commenced on this principle, we have a right to expect permanence and success. Our society will stand and will triumph. Onward shall be its course until it has done its work, and raised every man to his privileged level with his kind, and to the privilege of knowing and serving God.

The resolution says that abolition promises the sovereign and only safe remedy for slavery. Others speak of another remedy—and they are the enemies of abolition—they speak of a general insurrection of the slaves, and say this is the natural and inevitable result. They tell us to stand aloof, and let God take this work into his own hand—‘ why should we interfere to stay the thunderbolts of heaven ? ’ We are guilty indeed, and deserve God’s vengeance, but let us remember that God delights more in mercy than in vengeance. May we not believe that in his Providence, he has deposited abolition as a leaven in our land, destined to work until the whole country is leavened ? I believe our nation will yet be saved by abolition, and that God will not suffer us to plunge into insurrection.

It promises a *sovereign* remedy. Men talk of Mason’s and Dixon’s line, as if beyond that we could not reach with abolition. Why, as well pen up the wind. With these principles we have a fair field. We *can* send out truth, and no enactments can keep it out of minds—we can scatter light, and no legislative barriers can quench its rays—and more, the Holy Spirit is our helper to work upon the consciences of the guilty, and bring them to the embrace of the truth. It is the adoption of these principles which renders us invincible.

So far as abolition is embraced, it is peaceful and safe—it is resistance that makes insurrection. Temperance, wherever it prevails, brings happiness and peace, but where resisted or neglected, misery and vice prevail. Adopt abolition, and we shall be safe, except when the spirit of slavery rises in resistance. It is this, universally, that has made insurrection. I have had some observation and experience to prove the truth of what I say. I had the honor of being a member of the last General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. I attended a prayer meeting for the slaves, and for praying and speaking a few words in that meeting, I was censured by the tremendous vote of that venerable body. But I am happy to say, that *fourteen* members stood firm in anti-slavery principles; and I think the leaven is at work which will ever in future prevent a similar attempt in that body to suppress freedom of speech. That was an insurrection of the whole General Conference. In like manner have insurrections been excited; in Nashville, when Dresser was lynched for being an aboli-

tionist; in Boston, in New-York, in Canterbury and Canaan. (Applause.) Let abolition prevail, and peace will prevail.

Seconded by Rev. Mr. ROOT of Dover, who spoke as follows: Mr. President: It is asserted in the Resolution, that this enterprise promises the 'only effectual remedy for slavery.' I am one, Sir, who believe we can do something, and that we have a right to do it, for the relief of the slave. It is continually said, 'Your efforts can do no good, you are rivetting the slave's chains, you are driving the master to madness.' Sir, who are they with whom we have to do? Whom would we persuade to do righteousness, to unbind the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free? Fellow citizens. With these can we have no influence? I will not believe we cannot. It is a slander upon our southern brethren to say they are impervious to argument, and insensible to persuasions of justice and mercy. No class is more sensitive and chivalrous—none more alive to reputation. Gen. Duff Green says so. Gov. McDuffie says so. They feel that the reputation of the whole south is in jeopardy. They complain that we are holding them up to execration. This, Mr. President, is what we are doing. It is not in vain to address the south. Though they cry out against our interference, yet it is because they feel that they are about to be exposed—this we can continue to do—this we *will* do, till they QUIT STEALING. (Applause.) They are not immovable. The time *will* come, when they will give ear to our appeals for justice and mercy, and honor too. We have divine truth on our side, and it is injustice to God to suppose that his truth will not have effect. Only agitate, and agitate, and illustrate and press, and the work will be accomplished.

But it is said, and that not long since—'They have a *right* to their slaves.'—Monstrous! They have no right. Strange that at this day and in this part of the country such a claim should be set up. How easy to disprove their '*right*.' I appeal to the *sense of justice* in every breast. Look at the case. Suppose a few white citizens are captured by Algerines. Do you say *they* have a right to their plunder? A few years ago, when the Algerines captured a few of our fellow citizens, the news of the outrage electrified the land, a thousand voices spoke for justice, vessels were fitted out, and the public mind would not rest till our fellow citizens were rescued from their barbarous bondage. How fearfully inconsistent, now, should we allow 2,000,000 of our fellow men to be kept bound for years; and the number kept good for generations. The cases are parallel. No matter how many links connect the slave with his ancestors, rightfully free in their native Africa; no matter how long laws have legalized their bondage; they were born free, and no equal man can take away their birthright. Free they were originally, and no circumstances can change the nature of things.

How easy to disprove this claim from the Declaration of Independence. 'All men are born equal.' Whence then the right of one to usurp tyranny over another?

We disprove it too from the Bible. 'Thou shalt not steal,' 'He that stealeth a man shall be put to death.' The slaves can say as Joseph did, 'For indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews.' But if the Bible warrants slavery, then why not give them the Bible? Ah, they *dare not*. It teaches nothing like the *right* to hold men in involuntary bondage, nor as property. No; there is nothing can give a right but 'a *bill of sale* from the Almighty.'

I know something of slavery, I have seen it. But I would not rail against my brethren. I have experienced great hospitality. The southern people are a noble and generous race, and their good traits too frequently cover the odiousness of their slave system from the eyes of northern men. It is not uncommon for gentlemen from the North to make the tour of the whole South, and absolutely never to see slavery as

it is. They see and experience the generosity of the South, and return 'corrected of their prejudices,' as they say, and even in love with the whole system of things there. But it needs a residence of years, a citizenship there, to see the horrors of slavery. This was my lot.

One thought, to urge and encourage us in our course.—These men, for whom we plead, *cannot speak for themselves*. Their mouths are muzzled. How deplorable! Why, we think it an abridgment of the liberty of speech to be driven *here*, to utter our opinions; and perhaps it is partially so; but suppose you could say nothing. This is the slave's case. How cheerfully ought we to volunteer our services to plead the cause of the needy; and how hard-hearted he who is reluctant to speak, and to hear the story of oppression, and who shuts up his bowels of compassion! 'How dwelleth the love of God in him?' 'He that loveth God, loveth his brother also.' He, in his turn, shall cry and not be heard. How cruel and unchristian to shut up churches against this cause! Is not this stopping the ear from the cry of the poor and needy? How inconsistent with christian character!

Let us to-day avow anew eternal enmity to slavery. When we remember the contest of our fathers for liberty, how they spoke, and fought, and bled; can we let our voice cease, or our hands grow weary in the work of carrying out what they began? Whatever men may think, I would say, 'let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, let my right hand forget her cunning,' if I ever cease to speak and to act for the poor slave.

The great moral war is but begun. The collision of truth with error, of duty with expediency, will produce commotion, but truth and duty must and will prevail. Should my name reach the next generation, let it be found in connexion with Abolition. I would sooner be execrated as a tory of the Revolution, than to be known hereafter as one who stood aloof from or opposed the movements now in progress for laying the last stone on the yet unfinished temple of Liberty. (Applause.)

But above all; when I am summoned to judgment, let me then be found to have been the unflinching friend of God's poor; and let me hear my Saviour say, 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me—come, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' (Applause.)

Rev. Mr. RUSSELL, of Lynn. Mr. President, I hope the resolution will pass.—I feel it a duty and a privilege to make a few remarks. When I look around, I see much to discourage and alarm: but when I look back, and compare the present with the past, I thank God and take courage. It was my privilege to attend the first anniversary of this Society, at a time when colonization absorbed the mind of the nation, and there were few hearts to feel; few brethren and few ministers to speak directly for the slave. We now see an answer to our prayers, the result of our labors. What do I see? *Eight hundred Anti-Slavery Societies*, a multitude of minds feeling for us, pleading the cause of the needy, breasting the enemy, fighting, not with carnal weapons, but the keen and potent ones of truth and kindness and love. When I see this change, I am encouraged, and my heart leaps for joy. I look forward to the time when the banners of liberty shall wave universally over our land.

The resolution asserts the peacefulness of abolition principles. They are strictly so. But how often is it thrown in our faces, that 'you abolitionists are stirring up strife?' Sir, to this we plead both guilty and not guilty. We *have* 'stirred up,' (with emphatic gesture) and *ever* may we be guilty of 'stirring up,' while this inhuman apathy prevails. (Applause.) This effect has always been produced when truth has battled it

with error. When Christ appeared, He 'stirred up' a certain class whose wickedness he reproved. When arraigned before Pontius Pilate, this was the charge and the acclamation—'He stirreth up the people'—'crucify him—crucify him.' It was true in part. He 'stirred up,' not the people, but the Pharisees, Lawyers and Doctors—those 'whited sepulchres'—fair outside, but within full of hypocrisy and wickedness.

Follow the apostle Paul. He 'stirred up' the people too. When at Damascus, he preached Christ, the Jews were 'stirred up' to kill him, and it was only by his being let down by the wall in a basket that he escaped.—When he preached at Ephesus, the seat of Diana's temple, those whose craft was in danger were 'stirred up' by one Demetrius, and quite a mob was raised, the most part of which knew not wherefore they had come together—only they knew that Paul's preaching was opposed to their received religion, and so to put it down, they strained their throats for the space of two hours, crying out, 'GREAT IS DIANA OF THE EPHESIANS.' At Thessalonica too, the Jews which believed not, 'stirred up' 'certain lewd fellows of the baser sort,' and set all the city in an uproar, and assaulted Jason's house that harbored Paul and his company, and when they did not find them, drew Jason before the rulers of the city, and accused him of harboring those that had in other places turned the world upside down, and declared they had now come there for that purpose. Why, verily Paul had the spirit of a modern abolitionist, (applause)—wherever he went, some how or other the people were at once 'stirred up' to mob him.

It has been just so in every succeeding age. Luther stirred up Pope, Cardinals and Friars, till the church was reformed. Moral Reformers have ever turned the world topsy turvy, and 'stirred up' the people, till they should stand right end up, with their feet planted on the everlasting rock of truth. They are not so now. Heaven speed reform till disorder shall be rectified, and the world shall be brought to rights.

When Garrison enlisted in this cause, he did it to 'stir up' the people, and he HAS DONE IT. (Applause.)

There have been insurrections produced by abolition principles, but where and for what object? Not at Southampton to cut the throats of men, but at Boston to mob the ladies, (applause)—insurrections of 'gentlemen of property and standing' to make a coalition with southern nabobs. I will tell what I have seen. I visited Bath in Maine last year, and pleaded the cause of 2,000,000 of fellow men in the Baptist church there. Immediately the officers of the customs 'stirred up the people,' and said, we must put this down. Our vessels will be burned in the southern ports,—we can't carry their cotton—we shall lose our business. Drum him out of the town. When George Thompson came to Lynn, the people were 'stirred up' and exclaimed, 'we shall lose our shoes'—'our town will be ruined,'—and certain 'gentlemen of property and standing' gathered a company, and said to them, 'If you will mob him, we will find rum and eggs.' (Applause.)

But abolition light and love are going South. They are progressive, and soon will they kindle up a spirit of benevolence in our land which many waters cannot quench.

I have read the history of Slavery from the beginning, and have observed that insurrections are more to be traced to pale-faced aristocrats than to the suffering blacks. When Thomas Clarkson first preached abolition, who was it that would have thrown him into the dock? Those who got their living by the Colonial trade. What caused the insurrection in St. Domingo? When, after the French National Convention had voted to the free blacks the right of suffrage, 28,000 of these, with 30,000 whites, asked for their rights, and they were refused; it was not till they had been goaded on

by oppression for two years, that they at last rose in insurrection, and then not excited by abolitionists but by their oppressors.

Insurrection has always been excited by oppression, and not by preaching light and love. We have infinitely more to fear from the mad course of 'gentlemen of property and standing,' in the North, East, West and South, than from the slaves themselves. They are passive, and will endure while there is a gleam of hope; but extinguish that star, and they will be goaded to desperation. Extinguish the light we are sending out, and leave the slave not even a distant hope of freedom, and we shall witness in our country the scenes of 1794 in St. Domingo. Seal up our lips, and gloomy is the prospect for our land. Our only hope is in God, that while we labor for the slaves, they will continue submissive, until He who directs the counsels of nations shall either providentially mete out his vengeance upon their oppressors, or bring their Jubilee, when liberty shall be proclaimed to the captive and the opening of the prison-doors to them that are bound.

Rev. Mr. FITCH offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That, while we look well to the dangers which threaten ourselves, as the advocates of free discussion, we ought also to keep full in mind the wrongs and sufferings of the slave.

He spoke in support of it as follows:—Mr. President: There is danger, at this juncture, lest we lose sight of the end of our organization as an Anti-Slavery Society. We are opposed and oppressed. We are forbidden to speak and are driven into corners, and there is danger that in resisting oppression and claiming rights, we shall forget the greater sufferings of those for whom we plead. There is danger that our benevolence will degenerate into selfishness. Let us dwell less on our own wrongs and the danger that threatens, and think and say more about the infinitely more oppressive wrongs of the slave. I don't like this turning aside to inflict chastisement (deserved indeed) upon Boston.* I would leave Bostonians to the corrosions of shameful recollections, and to the lashings of their own consciences. (Applause.)

What are the wrongs of the slave? Perhaps you are a husband and a father.—You have by industry acquired a little which you determine to devote to buying a farm at the west. The time is fixed for removal. The night before you are to start, your house is broken open and your little all is lost. The plunderer you call a *thief*. This is a great deal to suffer, but what compared with the endurance of the slave? What name does he deserve who robs a man of himself? Or, what if just at the end of your journey, you are robbed of all, and left houseless and friendless amongst strangers or in a wilderness? You are yet a man and free, you have all the bodily faculties of a man, and can choose where you will go and what to do to support yourself and family. But what is the condition of the slave? With a mind that cannot be completely repressed, he feels the burdensome consciousness that he is almost a brute, nay, almost a thing. Is the wide world open to him? No. He must exist and labor at the will of another. He is robbed of a property, which you have not lost—himself. But suppose your wife is set up and sold to the highest bidder—your children too, sold and carried you know not whither. Can you imagine the outrage? This is **SLAVERY**. It is said that when we call this *robbery*, we use a hard word. I do not feel that it is. That word comes far short of expressing the amount of iniquity and horror of the system. **SLAVERY** is the hardest word that slavery can be called, and **SLAVERY** let it be called. But use not the word without thought. Gather into a force

* Alluding to a debate on a resolution introduced by Mr. Stanton, which was withdrawn, and passed in a modified form, the next day.

of feeling all your pity, horror and indignation for the sufferings of your brother, and then express it in one word—**SLAVERY** !

Why, I am told, it is common to work slaves to death. I do not mean an every day business, that would be unprofitable; but at certain junctures, to make close calculations and in time of good markets for cotton or rice, to deliberately task the slaves beyond their powers of endurance to hurry the crops into market. It is calculated they *can afford it* ! Yes, the increased price of cotton will more than replace the loss by death, of a few negroes ! ! Is **MURDER** a ‘hard word’ for slavery ? Who would not rather die any other way ?

There is another point I cannot bring up without shame. Perhaps there are some here who have heard what I am about to relate before; for I am in the habit of speaking on this subject in season and out of season. Bear with me. A fact. It is stated by a clergyman who learned it in Washington, and gives me liberty to repeat it, withholding his name. A pious physician of that city told him, that a mulatto female, a member of the same church with himself, called on him one day in great distress, for his advice. She stated that her master’s son was in the practice of compelling her to his bed. She dared not complain to his father.

[Mr. Fitch also alluded to an authentic case of criminal intercourse with a female slave on the part of a certain D. D. and his son at the south, and then remarked :]

This is slavery. Can any other word express it ? It is worse than forcible violation of female purity, for it legalizes the iniquity, and ‘so wraps it up.’ Is it not desirable to look to the sufferings of the slaves, and to do something that shall rectify moral sentiment at the south ?

Mr. GROSVENOR wished to refer to a fact in Roman history, in connexion with the facts related by Mr. Fitch. The topic is both delicate and indelicate. The incident is the case of Lucretia. She would survive her violation only long enough to make known the brutality of Tarquin. The exposure of her virtuous body to the eyes of the Senate, excited universal indignation, and the populace joined and drove the Tarquins forever from the throne. This occurred in heathen Rome; but in Christian America, Tarquins are protected by law, and our Lucretias are cut off from self-defence.

Mr. JOHNSON, a colored man, was introduced, who said he could tell us something about slavery. He *knew* what it was. I was born in Africa, several hundred miles up the Gambia River. Fine country dat; but we are called heathen in dis Christian—no—I don’t know what to call it—in dis—*enlightened heathen country*. (Laugh.) But the villagers in that country are very kind. When you go into house, first question is, have you had any thing to eat ? Bring water—you wash—and den eat much you want, and all you got do is tank em for it—not one sip you pay. If you are sick, nurse you, and make you well; not one sip you pay. If you want clothing, one womaa put in two knots warp, one puts in two knots filling, and so on; den men weave it, and you cut out just such garment you like; not one sip you pay. (Applause.)

When I was nine years old, I was out with my aunt to get figs; figs grow wild in dat country; I had to crawl amongst de bushes; when all at once I feel something pull my leg. I look round, and could see no aunt, nothing but man of my own color; and I never seed my aunt since. Dis man took me to Massurdo (Mesurado ?) First white man I ever see was Com. Bowen of Providence, R. I., and I tot he was de devil. (Laugh.) My own color told me he was a man, but I could not believe it. I was bwo’t to Savannah. I could not eat corn-meal; not used to it; so I have little bit

rice, and little hominy; then go out every day to 'plunder,' (get something to eat.) Dis kept me from being sold, till, being the last one, Capt. Boss look for me two days; den said you mustn't go way to-day; gave me all rice I wanted; set me upon table like dat, (pointing.) Capt. Boss talk to people; dey look at me, and feel of me. By and by, man wid mallet begin to talk and swing his mallet; dey talk once in while; he 'jabber, jabber, jabber,' I no undersand; den he fetch his mallet down, and all stop. Capt. Boss said, you go wid dat man. My master was Com. Bowen. He was more father than master. He always said he should set me free before he died. But he died soon, and I was left by will to his nephew, Judge Bowen, from Providence, with instructions that I should be free as soon as I could take care of myself. But not to dwell, I WAS IN SLAVERY. (A deep emotion was produced in the audience by this simple narrative.)

He stated some of his experience and observation of the evils of slavery. One day my master was dining with a gentleman who had a wife as black as dat hat. A young colored woman, as likely *for her color* as any lady in dis assembly, (a laugh,) waited on table. She happened to spill a little gravy on the gown of her mistress. The gentleman took the carving-knife, dragged her out to wood pile, and cut her head off; den wash his hands, come in and finish his dinner like nothing had happened! Do you call dat a Christian country? I never saw the like in Africa. Mr. Olney dropped his knife and fork, and eat no more. The cou'rt was sitting; he was then a lawyer. He told the thing to several, but they only said, 'That is a Northern man, he ain't used to our customs; let him take himself back again, if he don't like our ways.'

I have seen a Christian professor, after the communion, have four slaves tied together and whipped raw, and then washed with beef brine. I knew eight slaves once shut up in a barn one night, to be whipped next morning: it was winter, and they all escaped the lash, for they *died*! I have known a man offer \$500 for shooting a slave for going to meeting. I knew one Tom Buckine, he was whipped 150 lashes every Monday, and washed with brine, for going to meeting, but that did not stop him.—Directly after he was whipped, he would jump over fence and pray for his master.

It is common for the slaves to have 'stents,' and if you no do them, you get whip. If child cries, and mother has to stop to nurse it, and so the row gets behind, the husband helps it along to keep whip off wife's back, and frequently gets it on his own: for who could see a woman whipped for taking care of his own child? (Emotion.) *Slavery is most cruellest thing in de world.* [Mr. J. here expatiated very sensibly upon the peculiar evils of slavery in this country, and very suddenly pointed to Mr. Garrison, and said, 'Dat man is de Moses raised up for our deliverance.'—(Tremendous applause.) [The reporter did not perceive the connexion of his narrative of events in Boston, with those of his previous life. He said,] One night as he was going over to Cambridge, he stopped at the toll-bridge, and got into conversation with a man about the difficulty of getting pay for certain medical prescriptions, on account of not being a licensed physician. This man told him an easier way to get money. 'I can tell you how you can make \$5000 easily.' He 'took the hint,' (reference was had to the reward for Mr. Garrison's head,) and replied, 'I would not be the man to do that, I would defend him with my blood; I would wear a sword and cut the man's head off, who should offer to touch him.' (He also stated some anecdotes of 'Walker's Appeal.') I lent it to a man. He said, 'I have read your book.' Well, how you like? 'O, very well, all *but*—' Well, bring your '*buts*' to me; I've got an axe to chop them off. (Laugh.) He afterwards lent it to a Mr. Welch, who also liked it 'all *but*.'—He proposed the same disposition of his difficulty. Mr

W. said also, 'He (Walker) wants to shed blood.' He then had this argument with Mr. W.: 'Wan't you a transport?' 'No.' 'Well, your fathers were—banished to an island—dare not go back—death; came to this country; they (English) wanted to put them under 'injunction.' Now, how did you get liberty?' 'Our fathers fought for it.' 'Were you Christians?' 'Yes.' 'What! and fought for liberty—God forbid.' (Applause.) 'O, tread on an insect, and if it can do nothing more, he will bite your foot.' (Applause.) I will contend for liberty as long as I live. (Applause.) This day we are met to help the liberty of the slaves. Some say they had rather be slaves than free. What! If you had horse, would you give him a pint of corn a day; can a man be content wid dat? O! how many children, boy like dat, go to master's crib every Saturday night, and draw out two quarts corn for a week. Man and wife draw half a bushel, and two or three herring. What, if you hold em up in tumb and finger, de wind would blow em away, so salt eaten. Masters often give servant nine-pence to get food for dog; yes, he would pay dog's board, but leave slave to take care himself. [The narrator was requested to give an account of his escape from slavery. It would appear that Judge Bowen, in some way, took law, in reference to certain blacks, and in their behalf, into his own hands, so as to offend his fellow judge, and matters came to such a pass that Judge B. drew a pistol upon him in the Court House. 'They had an "insurrection" in court,' said Mr. J.; (his manner, and the previous references to 'insurrection,' caused a great laugh.) His difficulties finally compelled him to come to his native North. The narrator was brought along, though still held as a slave. The story became still more interesting and amusing, so that the reporters dropped their pens, and enjoyed the sallies of his wit with the audience.]

Mr. WRIGHT moved the thanks of the Society to Mr. Sears for the use of his loft for its anniversary.

Mr. AMASA WALKER. Mr. President, I second the motion. Mr. Sears neither expects nor desires a vote of thanks. He has cheerfully accommodated us, and he is not the man to fall into the current, when it is fashionable to proscribe and repress men for speaking their opinions. But I wish to say a few things suggested by the motion. It is doubtful whether even this place can be had for an anti-slavery meeting another year. It is a question whether there can be a hall for free discussion on this site; and if not, I know not but anti-slavery will be absolutely expelled from Boston, i. e. to hold its meetings. I trust we feel to-day, little fear of becoming extinct. The subject I am about to propose, then, is very appropriate to be brought before the Anti-Slavery Society, and claims regard from all the friends of free discussion in Boston, and even throughout the State. The Marlboro' Hotel property is now owned by the Free Church, under the title of the Marlboro' Corporation. They gave for the property \$46,000: to build will cost \$29,000 more; then the rents in front will pay the interest of all, and leave the Hall free. This is the object we wish to accomplish. Mr. Sears, who is trustee for the Corporation, could sell the property for \$10,000 profit to-day; but we are unwilling to let it go, without an effort to accomplish our wishes. We want, then, to borrow, not beg money enough to erect a large and commodious hall, that this city may have one place consecrated to religion and free discussion. 'Can't you get money?' No. This Corporation is poor. The wealth and aristocracy are against us. The Free Church has done nobly. They have put their shoulder to the wheel; but they can carry the enterprise no farther. How do we propose to raise it? We will mortgage the property for security for the necessary amount, give our notes for five years, and pay interest semi-annually. The Corpora-

tion perpetuate themselves, and by their act of incorporation, hold the property for the parochial interest of the Free Church.

Mr. MAY spoke as follows:—Mr. President, I rejoice that I am here. It will not be taking God's name in vain to say, I thank God that I am here—for if ever kind feelings, high purposes, holy resolutions were awakened in my heart, it has been in the meetings of this Society, or in the company of abolitionists elsewhere. Think not, sir, because my domestic ties have withdrawn me from my public agency in this cause, that my interest in it has abated, or my ardor cooled. This, I trust, will never be—certainly not until the crying abomination of the land is annihilated; and then, if I live to see that day, which cannot be far off, having joined with an overflowing heart in the grateful Hallelujah of the redeemed, I pray that I may have resolution, renewed and strengthened by success, to unite in an assault upon some other evil that afflicts our country and the world.

Mr. President, I am now, you know, a resident in the Old Colony—not many miles from Plymouth rock. My thoughts have often, of late, reverted to the memorials of those high-souled men, who first came there seeking an asylum from civil and ecclesiastical tyranny—and I have been impelled onward in the enterprise, which has brought us here to-day by the perception I have clearly had, that the abolition of slavery is but another and a broader phase of the same great and holy cause, for which our Pilgrim fathers and mothers cheerfully sacrificed all the comforts of life in civilized England—encountered the perils of a voyage across the broad Atlantic—and the hardships and dangers of living in this then howling wilderness.

(Here Mr. May went on at some length to trace the resemblance, and show the identity of their purposes and ours.)

If then, said he, fidelity to the sacred principles of civil and religious liberty, and of sound morality, public and private, demanded of our puritan forefathers so great exertions and sacrifices as they made, surely the far grosser violations of these same principles, which we see at this day in our country, demand of us at least as great exertions and sacrifices of personal comfort, to the extent even of our lives.

I know, Mr. President, I shall be told by some, that the resemblance I have endeavored to point out is not real—for the Puritans were molested in their *own* rights, persecuted in their *own* persons—whereas we abolitionists, they say, are meddling in other folks matters—we, who have none to molest us, or make us afraid, in the exercise and enjoyment of our own civil and religious privileges, are undertaking for persons whom we never saw, who are far away from us, and persons, too, who have never solicited us to assist them.

Sir, I am ashamed that there are men and women, ay, professed christians and christian ministers, too, in our country, who would have it thought, that a man must suffer injury in his own person, or his own rights before he can reasonably complain—that it is therefore no grievance, no concern of mine, that there are millions of my fellow beings, my countrymen, who are trodden down into the dust, who are denied every thing that makes this life pleasant, and are shut out even from the light of heaven. I am heartily ashamed, I am sincerely grieved that there are such men and women, professing christians too, in our land; but, Sir, it is notorious that there are such, many such in this Commonwealth, in this very city; ay, Sir, among the lineal descendants of the Pilgrims. To such, therefore, it is necessary to show, which can too easily be done, that we are ourselves most seriously molested, by the system of slavery and its abettors, in the exercise of our civil and religious liberties.

[Here he spoke of several respects, in which the colored and also the white citizens of Massachusetts suffer a serious abridgment of their privileges and immunities, in order that the slaveholders may not be disturbed in their unrighteousness.]

But these, Sir, which I have already mentioned, are trifles in comparison with others I am going to speak of. Although we of the North are citizens of this Republic, and as such must be partakers in the prosperity or adversity of the nation; although we see that from the beginning the institution of slavery has been a fruitful source of evil to our body politic; although we must of course share in the disgrace, that is brought upon us by this glaring inconsistency between our professions and our practices—and must ere long suffer with the rest of our guilty countrymen under the inflictions of the Almighty's hand, if his hand be not shortened that he cannot vindicate the unchangeable laws of his moral government; although, Sir, we have been brought to perceive, that we and our fellow-citizens of New-England have been and still are, in various ways, implicated in the sin of slavery, yet are we most peremptorily forbidden to repent, or to do any works meet for repentance. This, Mr. President, is the most cruel constraint that could be imposed upon us—to be compelled to be partakers of other men's sins, compelled to be silent in view of the greatest wrongs man can inflict upon his fellow. Rather than submit to this, who would not wear the chain himself? Yet this is the constraint which the abettors of slavery in our land would fasten upon us. They have summoned their hosts from all quarters. They have taken the reins of government into their own hands, and Jehu-like (all the while proclaiming their zeal for liberty) have driven through the land, trampling under foot every one who has dared to raise his voice above a whisper against American Oppression.

Sir, for one, I regard this as tending to the destruction not only of our civil liberty, but of our religion also. Would any one here present inquire, how it affects our religious liberty? We believe, I trust, that God is not to be worshipped by a service of the lips alone. We desire to be of that number, who love God not in word, neither in tongue, but in *deed* and in truth. 'Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?' Now, Sir, we do see millions of our brethren in this country, who have need of every thing that renders this life desirable, to say nothing of another; and I do contend that to require of us to withhold our compassion from them, to forbid us to plead for them, and rebuke the sin of their oppressors—to forbid us to do all we can to awaken a public interest in their behalf—to enter forcibly our meetings when we have assembled to consider their wrongs, and pray and consult together for their redemption—to burn up our books, and threaten us with punishment at common law, and to inflict punishment upon us without law—what is all this!—in the name of common sense, what is it? but to persecute us for righteousness sake,—to abridge the liberty of our consciences,—and to deny us the privilege, the inestimable privilege of following God as dear children—following the example of his beloved Son, who went about doing good, and who labored incessantly to expose the great wickedness of his nation, to enlighten the ignorant, and raise up those who were bowed down. I had much rather our opposers should attempt to prevent our ever entering *a place* of worship—ever offering a prayer to God in an audible voice, than that they should attempt, as they are doing, to prevent our worshipping our Heavenly Father in *deed* and in *truth*.

I might say more on this point, Sir, did time permit. But I trust I have said enough to show, that, in this country, the cause of civil and religious liberty is identified with the anti-slavery cause. And yet, Sir, with deepest shame I acknowledge,

this sacred cause finds but little favor in the metropolis of New-England, in the capital city of Massachusetts. Here, Sir, the birthplace of the American Revolution, the cause of impartial liberty is shut out from all the churches and halls, that are under the control of the citizens. Thanks to the representatives of the yeomanry of Massachusetts, we were well accommodated last evening. But, Sir, in this city, although Faneuil Hall is still standing, the friends of liberty 'once sacred, now trampled upon,' the friends of true liberty, can find no shelter *but this*. And I fear, Mr. President, that another year, we shall not have even so good a room for our meeting as this, unless the motion of my brother, who preceded me, shall prevail upon all, who are able, to assist in the erection upon this spot of a building such as is contemplated, and which we are assured shall be ever open to the advocates of our oppressed countrymen, and to every cause of moral reformation.

True, Sir, the building is to be appropriated in part to the use of a particular church, and that church of a denomination different from my own. But I am on that account none the less willing and anxious to have the members of that church well accommodated. To them, Mr. President, you know, and all the abolitionists of Boston know, that we owe more than to all the other churches in this city. They have done all it was in their power to do on our behalf. They have suffered with us and for us. And it is a pleasure to me to know, that we now have an opportunity to confer a favor upon them. I hope, I trust, this opportunity will be eagerly embraced by all truly liberal christians among us, of every denomination. I ask not any one to compromise his religious opinions. I have not compromised, and do not mean to compromise my own. I am as much of a Unitarian as ever—as much of a Unitarian as I am of an Abolitionist. But, Sir, I believe I am less of a sectarian, than perhaps I once was. Highly important as I deem the theological questions, that have been and still are in controversy between us and our orthodox brethren, I cannot consider them by any means so important as the *great moral principles*, on which is based the kingdom of Christ—the kingdom of righteousness, peace and joy in the holy spirit. I cannot regard doctrines, which too often play round the head but come not to the heart, so truly evangelical as those which stir men up to labor and to suffer in the cause of humanity. And when I see any one zealous and firm in advocating and maintaining the great moral, beneficent principles of the Gospel, him I desire to embrace as a brother in the Lord, let him be of what sect he may. I am free to acknowledge, Sir, that I do not feel so much united to a Unitarian, who is not an Abolitionist, as I do to one of any other sect, who is an Abolitionist. The more I have contemplated this subject, the more clearly have I been brought to perceive, that in our country *the true righteousness* must be *anti-slavery*. For the crying sin of our nation is the sin of slavery.—We all have been, we still are implicated in it. And that surely must be a very questionable sort of religion, that overlooks, or winks at the great transgression of our own time, and our own nation.

I do therefore, Sir, most earnestly hope that all the Abolitionists in the State, of every religious denomination, will cordially assist, as they may be able, in the erection upon this spot of the large and commodious building proposed, for the accommodation of our brethren of the Free Church, and for our own accommodation, whenever we may wish to assemble in this city again.

[The meeting, at this period, became interlocutory. Many informal inquiries were made respecting the proposed Hall: Who were to control it? What security would be given for its perpetual freedom? What were 'moral subjects?' (to which it was to be open)—What amount was wanted? &c. Mr. Walker afterwards spoke in a

very animated manner. A subscription of \$3,000 by Mr. Philbrick was announced, (applause,) which would be increased to £5,000, if the security was satisfactory.]— (Applause.)

Mr. GARRISON introduced the following resolutions, which were adopted by acclamation:

Resolved, That it behooves the friends of humanity throughout the country, and especially the people of the non-slaveholding States, to lift up their voices in thunder-tones against the admission of Texas into the American Union.

Resolved, That the continued and all-prevailing efforts of our beloved coadjutor George Thompson, in England, and the faithful and christian remonstrances of our English brethren, in opposition to American slavery, call for a renewal of our warmest thanks to them, and are exerting upon public sentiment in this country a most salutary influence.

It was then moved to adjourn, to attend the Ladies' A. S. Society at half-past two o'clock, P. M., and to meet at the Anti-Slavery Rooms, 46, Washington-Street, at 9 o'clock next morning.

FRIDAY MORNING.

Society met in the Anti-Slavery Rooms, Isaac Winslow, Esq. in the chair.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Himes.

Mr. Himes offered the following resolution, which was adopted:

Resolved, That the grant to this Society, by the Representatives of the people of this Commonwealth, of the use of the State House, in which to hold our Annual Meeting, is a keen rebuke to those churches in this city, who have refused to us the occupancy of their houses of worship, that we might plead in them the cause of two millions of American heathen—and is a decided proof, which we record with gratitude to God, that, although the political and religious aristocracy of Boston may oppose the progress of impartial liberty and righteous equality, the piety and democracy of the Commonwealth hate despotism, sympathise with the oppressed, spurn the gag, defend the rights of the minority, and advocate freedom of thought, of speech, and of action.

On motion of Mr. Southard, three thousand extra copies of the number of the Liberator containing the proceedings of this meeting, be ordered for gratuitous distribution.

Mr. Garrison read from the Glasgow Chronicle, some very interesting accounts of the proceedings of Anti-Slavery meetings in England, in which the labors of Mr. Thompson are spoken of in terms of unqualified approbation. This, said Mr. Garrison, is the 'renegade from justice!' In this country, the 'miserable fanatic'—in England, the 'indefatigable philanthropist,' (quoting from the paper.) He also read a very interesting letter from a Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society in England, to the Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society of New England, which was received with much applause. In this connection, the following extract of a letter from Rev. B. Godwin, of England, to W. S. Andrews, dated Oct. 6, 1836, was read, and ordered to be entered on the minutes of the Society, in connection with the resolution yesterday introduced by Mr. Garrison, in relation to the Abolitionists of Great Britain.

'I rejoice in the hope, that the two countries are becoming better acquainted and more closely connected. Never, I trust, will the sword of war be mutually drawn.— Mr. Breckinridge, in his letter to Dr. Wardlaw, has declared that general prejudice and dislike to America are prevalent in England. *He is greatly mistaken.* It may be the case among the High Church and Tory party, who dislike her free institutions, but *with no others.* We honor, we admire America; and, O! that she were but free from that plague spot, Negro Slavery!'

Mr. May offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That while we this day rejoice and give thanks to God, for the progress of our cause, we deeply lament the removal, by the hand of death, of several of our beloved fellow laborers in this work, particularly our much esteemed and deeply lamented George Benson and Henry E. Benson.

Mr. May said, he had often thought, while contemplating the progress of this cause, that justice is not done among men, to those who labor in private. We are apt to think that those whose names are continually before the public are the ones who are doing most in this cause. But, it is not so. I can never forget the deep impression made upon my own mind, by the private conversations of that excellent man, George Benson. I well remember the truthness of his mind to principles which were then new to us, but familiar to him. His epistolary correspondence, also, was abundant; and he always took occasion to press this subject upon the attention of his friends, to entreat and persuade those who stood aloof, and to rouse the apathy of the friends of the cause. I am unable—language is inadequate, to express the feelings of my heart, on this occasion. I have not ‘words that burn’—I have ‘thoughts that breathe,’ but cannot find words to utter them. And I feel that almost an equal tribute is due to the memory of his son, Henry E. Benson, late Recording Secretary of this Society.—(Here the speaker was so overcome with emotion, as to be unable, for a while, to proceed, and his feelings seemed to find a response from almost every eye in the house.) Having known him for years as a lovely youth, I have had the pleasure of knowing him for months as an indefatigable laborer in this cause. The adjoining room witnessed his incessant toil—there he labored, with an assiduity, which spared not himself—and there, I hesitate not to say, he sacrificed his life. We saw his health failing—we remonstrated—but he saw the cause suffering for just such labors as his—he went on—he lingered a little while, and—died. And, O, how he died! Would to God we could all die as he died! (Deep emotion.)

It was ordered, on Mr. May’s motion, that the Board of Managers be directed to make an appropriate entry upon the records of the Society, in relation to the death of George Benson and Henry E. Benson.

Mr. May made some statements respecting a letter he had received from a distant abolitionist, in relation to the *Liberator*, urging its support. It remonstrated with those who had become hostile to the *Liberator*, on account of the incidental remarks which the editor had made respecting the Sabbath. It dwelt upon the fact, that while many other anti-slavery papers took the opposite ground, in regard to this subject, with great zeal, yet the Quakers had not, on that account, withdrawn from them their support. Mr. May said that, on reading Mr. Garrison’s article, he immediately turned to Calvin’s Institutes, and found that the views presented by Mr. Garrison were precisely those entertained by that Reformer. I do not agree, said he, either with Mr. G. or Calvin on that subject—but I am willing to hear; and especially, I would not make Mr. G. an offender for a word; especially as he has not made it the object of his paper to propagate his peculiar views, but only alluded to them incidentally. We all know that the weapons of the enemy are aimed continually at Mr. Garrison. Mr. G. has the power of speaking in thunder-tones—he has spoken so—he has waked up the nation. O, had I the tongue and pen of Garrison, I too would speak in thunder-tones. I, for one, am determined, if Garrison is shot down, that the same ball shall carry me along with him! (Great applause.) Will any abolitionist be so timid, or so ungrateful, as to wish Mr. G. set aside? I rejoice that no power on earth can

set him aside—(here Mr. Garrison left the room.) I wish for some immediate action, to secure the support of the *Liberator* and its Editor.

Mr. Walker of Boston, said, this topic touches my heart. The success of the *Liberator* is identified with the success of our cause. The enemies of the cause would give more to have the *Liberator* stop, than any thing else. It is even now a great cause of exultation, that the *Liberator* languishes for want of support. The *Liberator* is entitled to a circulation of 29,000. It has been the great pioneer in this cause, and it ought to be the centre—the organ of the Society. We do not all feel perfectly pleased with *all* Mr. G. says. Like Martin Luther, his language is rough, and sometimes violent. But, Mr. Birney has said, ‘My Anti-Slavery trumpet would never have roused the country—Garrison alone could do it.’ Sir, I wish the *Liberator* might be adopted by the Society—at any rate, that we all feel a deep interest in its support.

The only trouble about the *Liberator* is, that it is always a little ahead of public sentiment. But, if nobody was in advance of public opinion, would public opinion go ahead at all? The complaint is, that it is *ultra*. Now, *ultra*, if I recollect my Latin, is *beyond*. The *Liberator*, then, is a little beyond us. Is not that the reason we are so ready to find fault with it? When slavery ceases, then I trust the *Liberator* will cease to be *ultra*. If we concentrate our influence, we may have a paper three times as large.

Mr. Stanton said, his excuse for saying any thing was, that he was an agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Wherever I have been, I have recommended the *Liberator*; and I know it to be the opinion of the Society I represent, that the *Liberator* ought to be sustained; and any one who is conversant with these matters must know that it is utterly out of the question for a moral reform paper to be sustained by its subscription list. It is often asked, ‘Why does not the American Society sustain the *Liberator*?’ The uniform reply of that Society to this question has been, ‘Why does not Massachusetts sustain it, as it ought?’

The views of these speakers were also sustained in an animated strain, by Messrs. Chaplin, Norris, and St. Clair; all agreeing that the *Liberator* must be sustained.

Mr. Garrison having returned, rose and said—Mr. President, without affecting any diffidence, I have been out and in several times during this discussion, hoping that it would be brought to a speedy close. It cannot but be grateful to my feelings—indeed, I am overwhelmed by a full tide of emotions—to know that my humble labors in this righteous cause are thus highly appreciated by those who are united for the peaceful but utter overthrow of American slavery. But, sir, while I duly appreciate the kindness and generous confidence of my abolition brethren, as exhibited toward me on this as well as on many other occasions, I am constrained to say, with all sincerity, that I think there has been too much said, and too frequent reference made, in applauding terms, respecting ‘Garrison’ and ‘Garrisonism’—certainly, many things have been uttered in my hearing, wholly unanticipated by me, and which ought not to have reached my ear. Still, though not far advanced in life, I have seen enough of the world, and the folly of courting the breath of popular favor, ever to feel elevated by human applause, or depressed by human censure. There is but one Being in the universe whose frown I dread, whose smile I seek; and if, in doing his will and acting in his service, I shall happily be hailed among the benefactors of mankind, to him be the glory forever.

Sir, the position which I occupy is purely accidental. What is it that has given me notoriety, and made me widely conspicuous? It is not that I have labored

so much more abundantly, or successfully, in the anti-slavery cause, than others: 100 I dare not measure my efforts with such men as Samuel J. May, William Goodell, Henry B. Stanton, Theodore D. Weld, Elizur Wright, and others. It is not that I have made any moral discoveries, or established any new principles. It is simply because I happened to perceive and expose the error and hypocrisy of a professedly benevolent Society, and to depict the true character of American slaveholders. For so doing, rewards have been offered for my head, lynch law has been administered to me, and the whole nation thrown into commotion. These things, and not any personal merits, have made me in some places an object of hatred, in others of sympathy, in all of notoriety. I have only echoed the 'self-evident' truths set forth in the Declaration of Independence—nothing more. Yes, something more—the cheering and thrilling sentiments contained in that book which tyrants have always proscribed, that 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men'—that he requires the oppressor to 'break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free'—that, 'in Christ Jesus, there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, but *all are one*.' The practical enforcement of these truths has alone caused me to be denounced as a madman and fanatic by my enemies, and unduly applauded by my friends.

I am accused of using hard language. Sir, I have not been eager to repel this accusation. It gives me no uneasiness, and I cannot suffer myself to be turned aside from my warfare against merciless oppressors to antagonize with captious critics respecting the propriety of my diction. This is not the time to consult rules of taste, and evince literary acumen. Who are my accusers? The entire South, reeking with pollution and blood—slaveholders, slave-traders, slave-drivers,—'recreant priest and lynch committee'—northern apologists for crime, and terror-stricken recreants to God and liberty—all charge me with using hard language!! Am I to give heed to such instructors, or to aim to suit their taste? Not so long as they trample upon the image of God, and justify robbery and pollution by wholesale! Not, sir, that I mean to say that I have always used the very best words, and have never violated the rules of good taste. No human composition is faultless—least of all is it to be expected, that the editorial articles of a newspaper, written necessarily in great haste, will always be precise in language and perfect in execution. But, sir, while millions are groaning in bondage, and women are sold by the pound, in our country, it is solemn trifling to think of sitting down coolly to criticise the phraseology of those who are pleading and toiling for their deliverance. The interests of this cause are too momentous to allow us to spend our time in studying rhetoric, or polishing our language.

One other charge. It is not only said that the Liberator uses hard language, but also that it is calculated to stir up the slaves to insurrection. But, even were this true, what American, who prides himself upon the fact that our fathers fought for liberty, will dare to arraign me for imitating their example? Is it wrong to resist oppression unto blood? A voice from Bunker Hill cries, 'No!' The gory soil of Lexington and Concord thunders, 'No!' A revolutionary war of seven years, and the conflict with Great Britain from 1812 to 1815, during which blood flowed in torrents, answer indignantly in the negative. The encouragement and applause given by the American people to the fighting Greeks and Poles, reply 'No!' Look at the doctrines promulgated by the slaveholders themselves! A prominent article in the Constitutions of Maryland and Tennessee is in the following words:—'*The doctrine of non-resistance to oppression is ABSURD, SLAVISH, and destructive to the good and happiness of mankind*'!! This authorises every slave in the land to rise up against his master. If it had been found in any anti-slavery publication,

it might well be termed an 'incendiary' document. You well remember, sir, that the young men of Boston sent a standard to the Poles, to stimulate them afresh in the work of butchering their oppressors. If another Nat Turner should appear in the South, what better motto could he select for his banner than the article I have just alluded to?

Sir, it is not pleading the cause of the oppressed, but oppression itself, which stirs up the slaves to revolt. Those who bind heavy burdens, and wield the lash of cruelty, and rob the poor and needy, and dispossess men of their bodies and souls, are the real instigators of servile insurrection. For myself, it is well known that I am an 'ultra' peace man, under all circumstances; that I dispute the right of any portion of mankind to redress their wrongs by violence; and that I could no more justify the slaves at the South in fighting for liberty, than approbate their masters in holding them in bondage. But the creed of the American people, which they have practically enforced, is, 'Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God.' Let them not marvel if the victims of their power should adopt it as their own.

One word as to the *Liberator*. I have no desire that it should be supported any longer than it is regarded as an useful instrument in the anti-slavery cause. I ask no man to approve of every sentiment contained in its columns, or to patronize it, except on the ground of its advocacy of the rights of plundered millions. It is neither my aim nor expectation to please every individual subscriber to the *Liberator*, in every particular: such a coincidence, while men differ so widely in their tastes and notions, on various subjects, is utterly impracticable. It must suffice, that free discussion is its motto, and that those who are opposed to me in sentiment are always invited to occupy its pages.

There must not, there cannot be, a spirit of competition between the *Liberator* and the publications of the American Society. But, it will be seen at once, that the *Liberator*, if left to depend upon its subscription list alone, cannot maintain its ground, whilst the *Emancipator*, for instance, sustained by the funds of the Parent Society, is issued on a much larger sheet, and afforded on the same terms. I do not wish the *Liberator* to be the organ either of this or any other Society, nor any body of men to be responsible for every sentiment it may promulgate; and I am quite sure that I shall not permit any persons to control my pen, or establish a censorship over my writings.

As the Sabbath question has been alluded to, allow me to say, that it has not been the object of the *Liberator* to maintain my peculiar views on that subject. I have inserted in its columns, many articles advocating either directly or indirectly the generally received opinions respecting the Sabbath; but none of my numerous subscribers among Friends has in consequence discontinued his subscription. In reviewing Dr. Beecher's speech, it was my object not only to convict him of gross inconsistency, but to enforce the truth that we are to be wholly consecrated to God at all times—to maintain a perpetual sabbath—to observe every day as holy unto the Lord. It was no Jacobinism that I wished to advocate. But the leading, all-absorbing object of the *Liberator* shall continue to be, as it has been hitherto, the overthrow of American slavery—not to conflict with any religious sect or political party.

After considerable discussion, as to the best method of securing the desired object, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Board of Managers be instructed to take such measures as they may deem necessary to sustain the *Liberator*; leaving its editorial department entirely in the hands of William Lloyd Garrison.

Mr. H. B. STANTON offered the following resolutions :

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States, by its recent vote to lay petitions for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, on the table, unread and un-referred, has virtually denied the right of the people to petition for a redress of grievances, and has stabbed the vitals of the U. S. Constitution.

Resolved, That while we disapprove the treacherous conduct of those northern Representatives who voted for that resolution, and declare them unworthy of the trusts confided to them, we do most cordially approve *the vote* of those gentlemen who recorded their names against it, and call upon their constituents, of all parties, to sustain them *in this particular*.

Resolved, That we do most especially commend the undaunted course of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, in defending the unrestricted right of THE PEOPLE to petition for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia.

Resolved, That we believe it to be the duty of THE WHOLE PEOPLE OF THIS COMMONWEALTH, of all political parties and of every religious sect, to rally now while they may, and, invoking the aid, and guided by the wisdom of Heaven, rush into the 'imminent breach,' to rescue the Constitution from ruthless violation, to save the cause of God's perishing poor from immolation, and to roll back the tide of anarchy and impiety, which is now flooding the nation.

Resolved, That we invoke the Legislature of this Commonwealth, as they love their fellow men and fear their God, as they love their country, have sworn to support its Constitution, and would perpetuate its freedom, to request their Representatives in Congress to use their influence to procure, without delay, the rescinding of the vote above mentioned, and to sustain, unbridged, the right of the people to petition that body:—and also, to instruct our Senators and request our Representatives to vote for the immediate abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia.

Resolved, That it is the solemn duty of THE PEOPLE of this Commonwealth, of all parties, to immediately petition the Legislature of this State, to thus instruct their Senators and request their Representatives.

Resolved, That THE PEOPLE of this State should vote for no member of the National or State Legislature, who is not in favor of freedom of speech and of the press, and the right of the people to petition for a redress of grievances:—and who will not sustain, by his influence and vote, the rights of the minority as well as the majority, in a free, unmolested, unawed expression of their opinions, on all subjects, and will not give to their petitions a respectful hearing.

Mr. Stanton said he thought he saw, from the aggressions of Congress upon our liberties, that our nation is on the downward road to ruin. For our sins, a righteous God is at open war with us. I am astonished, that in all our 4th of July orations, it seems to be taken for granted, that our liberties are secure, and the perpetuity of our institutions decreed by Heaven. But, Sir, it is a delusion. Our dearest rights are rapidly fading away. The right of petitioning for a redress of grievances, the barrier against the encroachment of arbitrary power, is denied to the people. Daniel Webster could talk of the people coming to the rescue, when the *Bank* was assailed. But, how contemptible is this party question of dollars and cents, compared to the interests involved in the denial of the right of petition ! Why, Sir, our liberty is but a name, our Constitution but a blotted parchment, unless this right may be enjoyed by the meanest—untrammelled, unmolested, unawed. I was in the State House, at the opening of the Legislature this winter, when the Governor administered the oath of office to the members. It was a solemn scene, when they invoked High Heaven to witness their promise to support the Constitution of the United States, and of Massachusetts. And, Sir, does not that body know, that while slaves are bought and sold as cattle, in the metropolis of this nation, our mouths are shut, our petitions are hurled back in our teeth, and, in defiance of the Constitution, we are told we must not speak on this delicate subject ?

When the Constitution is thus violated—when it is stabbed in its vital part—when the most sacred rights of the minority are offered up a living sacrifice on the altar of

despotic power—when the Constitutional safeguards to personal liberty, freedom of speech, of the press, of remonstrance, are ferociously attacked in quick succession, where is the **LOUD PROTEST** of the Legislature of this Commonwealth? Its members did invoke the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, to witness their solemn vow to support constitutional freedom:—and if we can get nothing at the door of Congress, can we get nothing at the door of the Legislature of Massachusetts? Has the free spirit, the glory of this ancient Commonwealth, departed? **LET THE PEOPLE TRY.** These resolutions, said Mr. S., are not intended to have a partizan bearing. They speak of the duties, not of a party, but of **THE ENTIRE PEOPLE**, of all parties and of all creeds. They aim a blow at all parties. Only one individual is spoken of—John Quincy Adams. He, certainly, belongs to no party. And to his credit I say it, all parties avoid him as they would a red-hot thunderbolt. He is too independent. His conscience is his own—which cannot be said of any thorough partizan.

Mr. Hall of Boston, approved of all these resolutions but the last. He did not rise for the purpose of finding fault, or cavilling; but he deprecated political action, at least in the present stage of the question, as it would excite much clamor, and in his opinion do much harm.

Mr. Garrison replied—He was surprised to hear that sentiment from one of the original signers of the Declaration of Anti-Slavery Sentiments, by the Convention at Philadelphia, which expressly states that we are to make use of ‘moral and political action’ for the removal of slavery. True, abolitionists have nothing to do with politics, as understood among politicians, with reference to the political parties of the day; but they have something to do with politics, so far as relates to this question. Surely, they ought not to vote for any man who will not maintain the right of petition, and go for the abolition of slavery, where Congress has the power; and this is all that the resolution affirms. Are we to be deterred from discharging our duty by the clamors of unprincipled and violent men?

[Further remarks were made by Messrs. Garrison, Hall and others, of which we did not take notes.]

Mr. STANTON. There is political action in this country, on this subject, at the present moment. We feel its oppression now. In the nature of things, there must continue to be political action. Our petitions are thrown under the table, to be swept out with the waste paper of the House, and they will continue to be. Then, the inquiry is, shall we sit quietly by, and permit the present political action to continue, (for continue it will,) or shall we introduce a system of action more in accordance with the spirit of our free institutions? Our brother says, let us avoid political action. Avoid political action? We have political as well as religious responsibilities. We might as well avoid the atmosphere and hope to live, as to dodge our political responsibilities, and to expect the favor of Heaven upon the discharge of our religious duties. In this nation, where the people rule, every man who has a vote, is bound to use it for the promotion of political and moral right.

Our brother speaks of ‘the consequences’ of such a course. The consequences of doing right? The motto of Abolitionists is, ‘Duty is ours—Consequences are God’s.’ Let us not seek to be wiser than Jehovah. But, to calculate consequences for a moment. From any conduct of ours, however unwise, I can scarcely conceive it possible that the consequences should be more disastrous than they now are. What may we expect will be the result, if every abolitionist determines not to vote for any man who will not act right on this question? It will not necessarily lead to the organiza-

tion of a political anti-slavery party :—but, every candidate who comes before the public, will be interrogated on this subject, and the consequence will be, that the present political parties will set up anti-slavery men. It has been so in the temperance cause:—it will be just so in this. Such has already been the case, in some parts of the country. The political papers in Mr. Slade's district, in Vermont, got into a warm contention upon the question, which of their candidates was the greater abolitionist ! I am no politician, in the common acceptance of that term. I abhor the conduct of both and all parties, and shun their squabbles as I would the miasma of a pest-house. But, I would fain have good men to rule over us. Let it be known that there are 10,000 men of uncompromising integrity in Massachusetts, who will not bow the knee to the Baal of party, and Baal tumbles to the ground. To secure these 10,000 votes, the contending parties will each nominate good men, and then, whichever may succeed, our end is attained. Then, too, abolitionists may vote according to their party preferences concerning other subjects, and yet their liberties be secure. But, whatever may be the result, the responsibility is upon us, and discharge it we must. Political action is now had, and will be, though we are silent. Shall the people so act as to renovate the politics of this country, and thus save our liberties; or shall they slumber on till they have passed away forever ?

The resolutions passed *unanimously*, except the last—and that, with but one dissenting voice.

Mr. JAMES SPOONER, Jr. introduced the following resolution, which was adopted :

Resolved, That the thrilling narrative of that stolen man Johnson, of itself, forcibly illustrates the meaning of Jefferson's declaration, ' I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just ; ' entirely removes the charge that Abolitionists magnify the evils of Slavery; and loudly calls for the *active* sympathies of every free man, woman, and child in our land.

Rev. Mr. EASTON, a colored gentleman, introduced the following resolution :

Resolved, That the spirit of insurrection and insubordination of the slave population of this country, is restrained more by the influence of the free colored people thereof, than by all the oppressive legislative enactments of the slaveholding States.

Mr. Easton said, the resolution intimated that the eyes of Abolitionists might get off the right object. Another thing, also : Abolitionists may attack slaveholding ; but there is danger still that the spirit of slavery will survive, in the form of prejudice, after the system is overturned. Our warfare ought not to be against slavery alone, but against the spirit which makes color a mark of degradation. He said the choicest interests of this country are, in the Providence of God, committed to the free people of color. They understand this ; I mean the intelligent portion of them. I speak as their representative, when I say they are conscious of the great responsibility that rests upon them. They hold an intermediate position between the oppressor and the oppressed, to oppose the opposition of the one, and to hold in check the exasperated feeling of the other.

Mr. STANTON remarked, that the agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society were instructed to wage the same warfare against prejudice which they do against slavery, and if possible to kill them both at one blow. The resolution passed.

After attending to some other miscellaneous business, the Society adjourned.

OFFICERS OF THE MASS. ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, FOR 1837.

PRESIDENT.

FRANCIS JACKSON, Boston.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

THOMAS LONGLEY, Hawley.	THEOPHILUS PACKARD, Shelburne.
JOSEPH SOUTHWICK, Boston.	MASON BALL, Amherst.
MOSES TILACHER, N. Wrentham.	ASA HOWLAND, Conway.
SAMUEL J. MAY, South Scituate.	GEO. GOODYEAR, Ashburnham.
GARDNER B. PERRY, Bradford.	E. L. CAPRON, Uxbridge.
ORANGE SCOTT, Lowell.	AMOS FARNSWORTH, Groton.
JOHN G. WHITTIER, Haverhill.	NATHANIEL EDDY, Middleboro'.
WM. OAKES, Ipswich.	GEORGE H. SMITH, Salem.
ISAAC WINSLOW, Danvers.	SAMUEL WILLISTON, E. Hampton.
LUTHER WRIGHT, Woburn.	THOMAS W. WARD, Shrewsbury.
ANDREW ROBINSON, New Bedford.	WM. WHITTAKER, North Salem.
C. P. GROSVENOR, Rutland.	

Corresponding Secretary—WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

Recording Secretary—NATHANIEL SOUTHARD.

Treasurer—HENRY G. CHAPMAN.

Auditor—SAMUEL E. SEWALL.

COUNSELLORS.

ELLIS GRAY LORING,	JOHN E. FULLER,
CHARLES FITCH,	JOHN T. HILTON,
ISAAC KNAPP,	ABNER FORBES,
JOSEPH H. EAYRS,	DRURY FAIRBANKS,
SIMON G. SHIPLEY,	S. PHILBRICK.

DISCUSSION

IN THE

MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

ON THE ABOLITION QUESTION.

[From the Boston Daily Advocate.]

WEDNESDAY, January 25, 1837.

The Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, after having engaged Julien Hall for their meeting, and advertised it, conformably, were ordered out of it. The Society yesterday morning applied for the use of the Hall of our House of Representatives, and it was granted without debate, but soon after the House found itself in the midst of the abolition excitement, as Mr. Field of Charlemont, moved the following order :

‘Ordered, That the committee to whom the subject of slavery has been committed, be instructed to consider what peculiar obligations are imposed on the non-slaveholding States, and Massachusetts in particular, in relation to slavery;’ which was carried, 114 to 87. Mr. Lee of Templeton, then moved to reconsider the vote, on the ground that this order would open a consideration of the whole subject of slavery, which he wished to avoid.

Mr. Park of Boston, asked the gentleman from Charlemont, if he did not, when he entered the House, hold up his right hand and swear to support the Constitution of the United States ?

Mr. Field of Charlemont, thought there might be some doubt as to the true construction of the Constitution in this respect, and therefore wished for ‘light.’

Mr. Goodrich of Roxbury, thought the order too broad and indefinite in its wording, and embracing too wide a field of inquiry.

Mr. Rantoul of Gloucester, did not see any present necessity for legislative action, and of course action would be unprofitable. When there *was* a real necessity, he would act, but he hoped the time would never arrive requiring the entertaining this question.

Mr. Richmond of Plymouth, hoped the subject would be discussed, and light thrown upon the constitution in respect to it. If we dare not look at this subject, we ought to stop praising ourselves in 4th of July orations, about our liberty.

Mr. Perkins of New Bedford, hoped the order would be reconsidered. As one of the committee alluded to, he was entirely unprepared to express any opinion on the grave constitutional questions involved in this inquiry.

Mr. Whittemore of Cambridge, hardly knew what the order meant, or what the mover would be driving at, and could not understand what possible benefit could arise

from it. He should oppose the passage of the order, not wishing to see the State of Massachusetts, *as such*, take any part in this controversy.

Mr. Field wished an opinion from the committee, based upon a deliberate examination of the whole subject.

A member, whose name we could not hear, (as the Speaker names them very indistinctly, and in a low tone,) opposed the order. The House had, this morning, granted the use of their Hall to the Anti-Slavery Society. If this order passed, the next thing would be to attack the right of property in slaves.

Mr. Blake of Boston, believed that no two members of the House disagreed on the abstract question of slavery; but, for God's sake, let us keep clear of that fanaticism on this subject which some other States are cursed with in respect to it, from the well-meant efforts of misguided individuals. There were obvious objections to entertaining this question, and he hoped this vote would be reconsidered, and another vote also, (giving the use of the Hall to the Anti-Slavery Society,) as intended to throw into this House the apple of discord and fire-brands of disunion.

The vote was reconsidered by an overwhelming majority, and the order then negatived.

Mr. Park of Boston, then offered an order that permissions for the use of this Hall be suspended, until the Committee on Public Buildings report on the expediency of the same. [This was designed to cut off the Anti-Slavery Society from the use of it, as granted in the morning.]

Mr. Park hoped the Sergeant at Arms would not be pestered with applications for the use of the hall—the hall was now *clean*, and he wanted to keep it so.

Mr. Richmond of Plymouth, trusted the Anti-Slavery Society would be allowed the use of it. If, after granting the use of it to others, we now took it away from this Society, after having once granted it to them, it would not look well.

Mr. West of Hadley, was in favor of the order, except that part of it which revokes an already granted permission to the Anti-Slavery Society; it would have a bad effect to do so, and so far from putting a stop to excitement, would increase it.

Mr. Gray of Boston, was inaudible from the bad cold which appeared to seize the members at the moment he rose.

Mr. Chapman of Greenfield, advocated the passage of the order so far as it was general, but objected to the special retraction of a grant.

Mr. Lee of Templeton, took the same ground.

The general branch of the order was then passed almost *nem con*.

The suspending clause being then put—

Mr. Turner of Scituate, hoped the permission already granted to the Anti-Slavery Society would not be reconsidered—it was fairly given, and should not be retracted.

Mr. Kinsman of Boston, moved an amendment, that the committee report forthwith. Negatived by a large majority.

The suspending clause was then negatived, 210 to 180.

THURSDAY, January 26.

Mr. Johnson of Andover, yesterday moved to reconsider the vote by which the use of the Representatives' Hall was granted to the Anti-Slavery Society for last evening.

Mr. Park of Boston, (the great agitator of this subject,) asked for a candid hearing.

Mr. Johnson said the gentleman could not be heard, to which

Mr. Park rejoined, that such a complaint had never been made before in respect to him.

Mr. Park went on to say, that he endeavored yesterday to get rid of this matter by a *side wind*, but as that did not obtain, he should try it again.

He now objected to the notice of the Anti-Slavery Society, in which it is announced that one Amos Dresser, a man who has been *lynched*, would address the meeting this evening, and they intended to adjourn here from a stable loft, to send all over the Union, the fame of this great meeting in the Representatives' Chamber.

He had nearly been lynched himself last year, while attempting to rescue females from the mob in front of the Anti-Slavery Rooms in Washington-street, being mistaken for an abolitionist !

This subject was pressed in such a manner, that he should not be *mealy mouthed* in respect to it. He feared the effect the meeting here would have all over the Union. It would be bruited in the public prints in the strongest terms.

A motion was made to adjourn, but negatived.

Mr. Richmond of Plymouth, said he, as well as the gentleman from Boston, felt *some* regard for the credit of the Commonwealth; he did not wish to see its plighted word retracted.

The gentleman talks about a lynched man—lynched for what ? why, for telling the truth. We have slept over these matters long enough.

These petitions do not break windows and tear down houses: it was those who opposed them. He would venture to predict that if this vote was reconsidered, the anti-slavery cause would be strengthened. He spoke with a good deal of warmth of the right of discussion, and the right of the slave to be free. He thought it a most important subject—this violence that had been done to a northern citizen—and he thought it quite time to inquire if such things could be done by the southerners with impunity.

Mr. Folsom of Hingham, advocated the reconsideration. Why do not these philanthropists go to the south, and beard the lion in his den—not stay here barking behind his back ?

Mr. F. went on in a very hyperbolical strain about the integrity of the Union being endangered.

Mr. Ward of Danvers, thought it would be impolitic and unjust to withdraw the consent of the House, after it had once been given in an affair of this kind. The House had pledged itself—and should it now stultify itself, by assuming that it did not know at the time what it had granted ?

A member in the gallery, hoped we should not retract our pledge; it would look like persecution.

Mr. Abbot of Andover, said after the notice had gone out in the public prints, it was too late to retract; it would be impolitic now to refuse what we have once granted.

He had no fear of a mob, and trusted that the citizens of Boston had too much good sense to attack the right of free discussion. If the hall is refused, it will produce a shock or revulsion of feeling in favor of the Anti-Slavery Society.

Mr. Cook of Boston, was not present yesterday: if he had been, he should have voted against it; but he now considered the *honor of the House pledged*; the use of it had been granted, and there was no honorable retreat. He moved to lay the order on the table; negatived, 228 to 190.

Mr. Park said, 'change makes change.' The Society had changed their ground—

they asked for free discussion, but now they announce a man for exhibition, who has been lynched.

Mr. Ruggles of Fall River, said he last year opposed the granting the use of this hall to the Colonization Society, without at the same time giving the same privilege to its rival, the Anti-Slavery Society.

If we now refuse that equal treatment, it will be said that we are committed to slavery. The gentleman (Mr. Park) put his opposition to the use of the Hall on the ground of mobs. Good God ! has it come to this ? Are the House afraid that 'the gentlemen of property and standing' in this city will mob us in our own Hall ? Is it indeed true, that free discussion is destroyed in the very cradle of liberty ? He hoped not. He despised the contemptible, craven spirit, prevailing on this subject. He would maintain free discussion as long as the breath remained in his body, let come what would. He did not fear the gentlemen of property and standing—let them do their worst. He trusted the deep disgrace would not rest upon the city of Boston, of mobbing a man who came here to tell us of the outrages committed upon him by southern slaveholders.

During the discussion, two or three efforts were made to adjourn, and to lay the question upon the table : but the House put them all down—being determined to take the question of reconsidering—which was decided in the negative—233 voting in the affirmative, and 224 in the negative.

Mr. Ruggles of Fall River, was truly eloquent in his defence of the right of free discussion. We have seldom heard a more manly, noble eloquence, than he evinced on this occasion. It was of the true sort, coming as it did from the heart

Dr.

} **Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in account Current** }

Cr.

1836.		1836.	
Jan. 16.		April 9.	
To balance old account		By rents	
To paid Agents during the year		By donations to 24th January, 1837	
" advertising	\$ 3 24		\$ 25 09
" Carpenter's bill	1166 69		3721 41
" rent of Office	7 47		
" for Printing and for publications	20 00		
" Lewis Tappan, Treas. Am. A. S. Society, the pledge of Boston Female A. S. S.	56 25		
" Reporter at Convention in May	1447 57		
" Atkinson for a 'Sign'	200 00		
" Salem-St. Society, rent of Church	75 00		
" balance due Noves' Academy	20 00		
" Charles Whipple balance of account	45 00		
" S. H. Gimber for engraving plate	321 00		
" sundry persons for loans	129 18		
1837.	60 00		
Jan. 24.	106 00		
To cash on hand	89 00		
	\$ 3716 44		\$ 3746 44

Boston, Feb. 3, 1837.—I have examined the above account, and find the same duly vouched and correctly cast.

F. E. HENRY G. CHAPMAN, *Treasurer.*

S. E. SEWALL, *Auditor.*

DONATIONS TO THE SOCIETY, FOR THE YEAR 1836.

B. Scott, Salisbury	\$ 2,00	Amount brought up	\$2659,50
Hanover A S Society	78,50	Abigail Carter, New Bedford	5,00
Rev. Mr. Harding's society, Wal-		Sarah P. Carter, "	5,00
tham	13,70	Elizabeth A. Carter, "	5,00
Attleboro A S Society	6,00	Abby G. Carter, "	5,00
Col. at An. meeting, Jan. 20	106,50	Joseph Carter, "	15,00
Union Char. Soc. Salem	10,09	Anna E. Colton, Worcester	5,00
T. Campbell, Salem	1,00	Daniel Gregg, Acton	20,00
John Ford, Abington, collections	14,50	Thomas Brooks, "	2,50
James Morrell, Boston	2,00	L. M. Wilder, Hanover	25,00
Miss H. Sargent, "	1,00	J. Curtis, "	4,00
J. Gifford, Sandwich A S S.	5,00	Jacob Dodge, Wenham	2,00
Haverhill Female A S S.	5,00	Assessments at Convention	80,82
Mary G. Chapman	3,00	L. M. Wilder, Hanover, L. M.	15,00
From individuals in Worcester	22,00	A friend	1,00
Mr. Lovell, Cambridge	1,00	L. M. Bidwell, Lowell	5,00
Plymouth County A S S.	50,00	Thomas Drew, Salem	1,00
Holden A S S. by J. E. Cheney	15,00	Jacob Noyes, Boston	5,00
Joseph Southwick, Boston	100,00	Woodstock, Ct. by A. Walker	1,10
John Sullivan, "	35,00	Thomas W. Durant, Roxbury	5,00
Lynn A S S. by C. Robinson	100,00	A friend	3,00
Wm. Lloyd Garrison, an. sub.	5,00	Edward N. Harris, L. M.	15,00
A. A. Lane, Boston	1,00	Rev. I. Sawyer, L. M. by S. Read-	
L. Greenwood, "	6,00	ing Female A S S.	15,00
Lewis Hersey, "	1,00	John S. Kimball, Boston	100,00
Ashburnham A S S.	11,00	Edmund Jackson, "	100,00
J. T. Woodbury, Acton, sub. to		Drury Fairbanks, " L. M.	15,00
S. J. May's agency	25,00	S. Philbrick, "	100,00
Holliston A S S.	19,23	Mrs. S. Philbrick, "	50,00
Lynn Female A S S. to constitute		A friend, by H. G. Chapman	100,00
D. Henshaw and T. H. Atwell		Dr. A. Farnsworth, Groton	100,00
Life Members	30,00	Chris. Robinson, Lynn, L. M.	15,00
Ann T. Greene, Boston	200,00	Calvin Temple, Reading, L. M.	15,00
Henry Chapman, "	100,00	Mary Weston, Weymouth	2,81
Ellis Gray Loring, "	100,00	Col. at Rev. Mr. Bent's church,	
Francis Jackson, "	100,00	Falmouth	2,35
Henry G. Chapman, "	110,00	Mrs. Elijah Demond, L. M.	15,00
Drury Fairbanks, "	10,00	Hiram A. Morse, L. M.	15,00
Boston Female A S S.	1000,00	Bosboro' A S S. by Rev. J. W.	
Miss Rice, matron Sam. Asylum	2,00	Cross	20,00
By hands of J. E. Fuller, to consti-		Collec. at 46 Wash. St., Nov 13	24,12
tute Life Mem. of Isaac Wins-		Jesse Allen	2,00
low, Danvers; John Rogers, Bos-		Mary Hardy	4,00
ton; A. Bowen, Fall River; H.		Josiah Hayward, L. M.	15,00
Chase, do.; J. Noyes, Boston	70,00	E. T. Pritchett, L. M.	15,00
For the same of Lydia B. Capron,		Asso. in Groton, by T. S. Andrews	5,71
Gilbert E. Capron, A. Bassett,		Rebecca Louge	5,00
Sarah Easton	60,00	S. E. Sewall	4,00
To constitute Rev. S. H. Peckham,		Daniel Holbrook	20,00
Life Member, by ladies	15,00	James Christie	10,00
John J. Appleton	43,37	Francis Clark	15,00
To constitute Rev. N. Hervey, Mar-		John E. Fuller	5,00
blehead, L. M. by R. Woodbridge,	15,00	Benj. Kingsbury	50
Nath. Thurston, Lowell	1,00	Rev. James R. Cushing, L. M. by	
A friend, "	1,00	E. Haverhill Female A S S.	15,00
Joseph Wilson, "	5,00	Squires Shove, Danvers	10,09
Contributions at Convention	99,70	Rev. Jonas Perkins, Weymouth, L.	
A friend	3,00	M. by Weymouth & Braintree	
* Friend ' to the slave, by A. Rand	37,00	Female Lman. Society	15,00
A friend to the slave, New Bedford	18,00	A friend	6,00

\$2659,50

Total

\$3721,44

DONATIONS

*Taken up at the Annual Meeting of the Society, held in the Stable Loft
January 25, 1837.*

Taunton A. S. Soc. by Mr. Read	\$25.00	Amount brought up	\$113.46
Abraham Williams, Salem	1.00	Miss Miriam Jackson, Boston	1.00
William Colman, "	1.00	Dr. Amos Farnsworth, Groton	50.00
Thomas Drew, "	1.00	Samuel Williston, E. Hampton	100.00
Schuyler Lawrence, "	50	James Spooner, Plymouth	3.00
Mrs. Venus Manning, L. M. by		L. Richardson, "	1.00
Baron Stow	15.00	East Randolph by F. Holbrook	20.00
Union Char. Soc. of colored peo-		Abner Sanger, Danvers, L. M.	15.00
ple in Salem	10.00	Edwin Morton, Plymouth	10.00
Collection at the door	\$2.96	Andrew Robeson, New Bedford	50.00
J. T. Hilton, Boston	2.00	Lea Robinson, Boston	5.00
Solomon Woodward, Taunton	5.00	T. W. Durant	5.00
	<u>\$143.46</u>	Total	<u>\$493.46</u>

HONORARY MEMBERS

OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Arthur Tappan, New-York.	William Ridgway, England.
William Rawle, Philadelphia.	Josiah Wedgwood, do.
Rev. S. J. May, Scituate, Mass.	Capt. C. Stuart, do.
Rev. S. S. Jocelyn, New Haven, Ct.	Joseph Phillips, do.
Rev. George Bourne, New-York.	William Wilberforce, do. (dec.)
Hon. S. Crafts, Craftsbury, Vt.	Thomas Clarkson, do.
Hon. A. Clark, Danville, Vt.	Henry Newman, do. (dec.)
Rev. W. A. Chapin, Craftsbury, Vt.	William Crawford, do.
H. Merrill, Esq., Peacham, Vt.	Edward S. Abdy, do.
Moses Brown, Providence, R. I. (dec.)	George Thompson, do.
Rev. O. S. Murray, Orwell, Vt.	David L. Child, Esq.
J. Ridgway, Staffordshire, Eng.	Rev. Amos A. Phelps.

LIFE MEMBERS

OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

John Kenrick, Newton. (dec.)	Joseph Southwick, Boston.
Prince Farmer, Salem.	Amasa Walker, do.
John Remond, Salem.	John C. Smith, do.
Charles Stuart, England.	Edmund Jackson, do.
George Thompson, "	William Carleton, do.
Edward S. Abdy, "	George B. Emerson, do.
Samuel E. Sewall, Boston.	I. S. Withington, do.
Daniel Gregg, "	Henry Chapman, do.
Charles C. Barry, "	Samuel Philbrick, Brookline.
Ellis Gray Loring, "	Isaac Winslow, Danvers.
James C. Odiorne, "	W. Farnsworth, Roxbury.
Isaac Knapp, "	Rev. A. Jackson, Kingston.
William H. Hayward, "	E. L. Capron, Uxbridge.
Increase Gilbert, "	Moses Brown, Providence, R. I. (dec.)
Rev. E. M. P. Wells, "	Rev. G. B. Perry, Bradford.
Wm. Lloyd Garrison, "	Rev. E. Seagrave, Attleborough.
Benjamin C. Bacon, "	Rev. Jotham Horton, Lynn.
Rev. Henry Jones, Cabot, Vt.	Rev. P. R. Russell, do.
Rev. D. T. Kimball, Ipswich.	Richard Clapp, Dorchester.
Dr. I. Kittredge, Beverly.	Rev. J. W. Cross, Boxborough.
Dr. C. T. Hildreth, Boston.	A. F. Boston.
Silas Osborn.	S. H. Winslow, Portland, Me.
Wm. Oakes, Ipswich.	Angelina E. Grimke, Philadelphia.
Ebenezer Dole, Hallowell.	Eliza Watson, Boston.
John Taylor, Bath, Me.	Daniel Henshaw, Lynn.
Edward Southwick, Danvers.	Thomas H. Atwill, Lynn.
Joseph Tillson, Boston.	Isaac Winslow, Danvers.
Phineas Wheeler.	John Rogers, Boston.
Mrs. George Thompson, England.	Abraham Bowen, Fall River.
Mrs. Calvin Philleo.	Harvey Chase, do.
Mrs. Amos A. Phelps, Boston.	Jacob Noyes, Boston.
Mrs. Increase Gilbert, "	Lydia B. Capron.
Mrs. S. H. Winslow, Portland, Me.	Gilbert E. Capron.
Mrs. C. Winslow, "	A. Bassett.
Mrs. J. C. Smith, Boston.	Sarah Easton.
Miss Susan Paul, Boston.	S. H. Peckham.
William Rotch, Jr. New Bedford.	Rev. N. Hervey, Marblehead.
Andrew Robeson, "	I. M. Wilder, Hanover.
Dr. Charles Follen, New-York.	Rev. Edward N. Harris.
Rev. George B. Cheever, Salem.	Rev. Isaac Sawyer, South Reading.
Rev. C. P. Grosvenor.	Drury Fairbanks, Boston.
Joseph Sewall, Esq., Boston.	Christopher Robinson, Lynn.
Francis Jackson, Esq. do.	Calvin Temple, Reading.
Rev. Henry C. Wright, do.	Mrs. Elijah Demond.
John Sullivan, do.	Hiram A. Morse.
Perez Gill, do.	Josiah Hayward.
D. Chute, do.	E. T. Pritchett, Amherst.
John S. Kimball, do.	Rev. James Cushing, East Haverhill.
Marcus Whiting, do.	Rev. Jonas Perkins, Weymouth.
Timothy Gilbert, do.	Mrs. Venus Manning.
Rev. Baron Stow, do.	Abner Sanger, Danvers.
Rev. J. V. Himes, do.	

